THE MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Southwestern College
Winfield, Kansas

QUARTERLY JOURNAL of SPEECH

Speech Association of America

FEBRUARY · 1959
Volume XLV · Number 1

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 1959

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Editor
Donald C. Bryant
11-A Schaeffer Hall
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Editor-Elect
Richard Murphy
University of Illinois

Associate Editors

Carroll C. Arnold	BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS	Cornell University
Wallace A. Bacon	INTERPRETATION	Northwestern University
Earnest S. Brandenburg	ADULT EDUCATION	Washington University
Robert D. Clark	HOMILETICS AND PREACHING	University of Oregon
Carl A. Dallinger	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	State University of Iowa
Douglas Ehninger	PUBLIC SPEAKING AND FORENSICS	University of Florida
Leland M. Griffin	AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS	Northwestern University
Robert G. Gunderson	NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW	Indiana University
Warren Guthrie	TV AND RADIO	Western Reserve University
Marie K. Hochmuth	RHETORIC AND CRITICISM	University of Illinois
John V. Irwin	SPEECH AND HEARING	University of Wisconsin
Magdalene Kramer	TEACHING OF SPEECH	Teachers College, Columbia University
Richard Murphy	SHOP TALK	University of Illinois
David Potter	BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING	Michigan State University
Claude L. Shaver	DRAMA AND THEATRE	Louisiana State University
C. K. Thomas	PHONETICS	University of Florida
William E. Utterback	DISCUSSION	Ohio State University

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with THE MLA STYLE SHEET may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $3.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is bound in each December JOURNAL. The contents are also indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX. For volumes prior to 1929 consult the READERS GUIDE TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, VOLUMES I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING; Volumes IV-XIII, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

Copyright 1959 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

SPEECH ASSOCIATION *of* AMERICA

Founded, 1914
Incorporated, 1950

OFFICERS

JOHN E. DIETRICH, *President*	Ohio State University
J. JEFFERY AUER, *Executive Vice-President*	Indiana University
KENNETH G. HANCE, *First Vice-President*	Michigan State University
RALPH G. NICHOLS, *Second Vice-President*	University of Minnesota, St. Paul
DONALD C. BRYANT, *Editor, The Quarterly Journal of Speech*	State University of Iowa
JOHN BLACK, *Editor, Speech Monographs*	The Ohio State University
KARL F. ROBINSON, *Editor, The Speech Teacher*	Northwestern University
OWEN PETERSON, *Executive Secretary*	Louisiana State University

OFFICERS-ELECT

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor-Elect, The Quarterly Journal of Speech*	University of Illinois
DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor-Elect, Speech Monographs*	University of Florida

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Term Expires 1959

J. JEFFERY AUER, Editor, *Speech Monographs*, 1954-1956; Ex Officio, 1957-1959	Indiana University
ROBERT D. CLARK, Elected by SAA, 1956	University of Oregon
KENNETH G. HANCE, First Vice-President	Michigan State University
WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL, Editor, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1954-1956; Ex Officio, 1957-1959	Princeton University
RALPH G. NICHOLS, Second Vice-President	University of Minnesota, St. Paul
KARL F. ROBINSON, Elected by SAA, 1956	Northwestern University
LESTER THONSSEN, President of SAA, 1956; Ex Officio, 1957-1959	College of the City of New York

THE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Term Expires 1960

WALDO W. BRADEN, Executive Secretary of SAA, 1954-1957; Ex Officio, 1958-1960 — Louisiana State University

THORRELL FEST, Elected by SAA, 1957 — University of Colorado

KENNETH G. HANCE, Executive Vice-President, 1955-1957; Ex Officio, 1958-1960 and Member of Finance Committee — Michigan State University

HENRY L. MUELLER, Editor, *The Speech Teacher*, 1955-1957; Ex Officio, 1958-1960 — University of Illinois

ROBERT T. OLIVER, Elected by SAA, 1957 — Pennsylvania State University

OWEN PETERSON, Executive Secretary of SAA, July 1957-June 1960 — Louisiana State University

LOREN D. REID, President of SAA, 1957; Ex Officio, 1958-1960 — University of Missouri

Term Expires 1961

WALDO W. BRADEN, Member of Finance Committee — Louisiana State University

ELISE HAHN, President of SAA, 1958 Ex Officio, 1959-1961 — University of California at Los Angeles

LEROY T. LAASE, Elected by SAA, 1958 — University of Nebraska

ROBERT WEST, Elected by SAA, 1958 — Brooklyn College

Term Expires 1962

J. JEFFERY AUER, Member of Finance Committee — Indiana University

JOHN W. BLACK, Editor, *Speech Monographs*, 1958-1959; Ex Officio, 1960-1962 — The Ohio State University

DONALD C. BRYANT, Editor, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1957-1959; Ex Officio, 1960-1962 — State University of Iowa

JOHN E. DIETRICH, President of SAA, 1959; Ex Officio, 1960-1962 — The Ohio State University

Term Expires 1963

KARL F. ROBINSON, Editor, *The Speech Teacher*, 1958-1960; Ex Officio, 1961-1963 — Northwestern University

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOL. XLV · FEBRUARY 1959 · NO. 1

Sources of the Elocutionary Movement in England: 1700-1748 — *Wilbur Samuel Howell* — 1

Rhetoric and the Literature of the English Middle Ages — *Donald Lemen Clark* — 19

Lord North's Posture of Defense (The British Orators, VI) — *Charles Daniel Smith* — 29

The Dramatic Criticism of Oratory — *Barnet Baskerville* — 39

From Iowa to Greece: The Achievement of George Cram Cook — *Arthur E. Waterman* — 46

Types of Indonesian Professional Theatre — *James R. Brandon* — 51

Discussion Contests Versus Group-Action Tournaments — *Wayne E. Brockriede* and *Kim Giffin* — 59

The Forum — 65

- Know Your Enemy — *Richard Rothman* — 65
- Who Is to Blame? — *Bruce B. Klee* — 66
- Against the Filibuster — *Wayne Brockriede, Carl A. Dallinger* — 67
- Speech in the U.S.S.R. — *A. L. McLeod* — 68
- Four Heresies in the Teaching of Drama — *Harold Orel* — 69
- Addendum on Public Recitation in Japan — *James R. Brandon* — 71
- Fuller Explanation — *R. Reyes* — 71
- Report of the Nominating Committee — 72
- Rhetoricians and Free Speech — *Robert W. Smith* — 74

New Books in Review — *Robert G. Gunderson* 76

Some Recent Books on the Drama — *William C. McCollom* 76

Chaucer: A Critical Appreciation — *Herbert Feinstein* 81

In Praise of Love — *Irving Deer* 82

Othello — *Pat M. Ryan, Jr.* 83

Theatre World: Season 1957-1958; Theatre World Annual (London) Number 8: A Pictorial Review of West End Productions With A Record of Plays and Players, 1956-1957; *and* International Theatre Annual, No. 2 — *Eugene K. Bristow* 84

The Cathedral; The Witnesses and other Poems; *and* The World Turned Upside Down — *Robert T. Oliver* 85

La Nouvelle Rhétorique Traité de L'Argumentation — *Paul D. Brandes* 86

American Studies in the United States, A Survey of College Programs — *Waldo W. Braden* 86

Evaluation in the Basic College at Michigan State University — *Franklin H. Knower* 87

The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson — *Lee S. Hultzén* 87

Hawaiian-English Dictionary — *C. M. Wise* 88

Language Thought, and Culture; The Humanity of Words; *and* The Field Theory of Meaning — *William Kay Archer* 89

Readings in Applied English Linguistics — *Arthur J. Bronstein* 90

The Improvement of Voice and Diction — *Alfred J. Sokolnicki* 91

Television: Techniques for Planning and Performance — *John P. Highlander* 92

Broadcasting in Australia — *A. L. McLeod* 92

Speaking for Results: A Guide for Business and Professional Speakers — *Robert P. Friedman* 93

Speech Practices: A Resource Book for the Student of Public Speaking — *Robert C. Jeffrey* 94

Handling Barriers in Communication: Lecture-Discussions and Conferee's Handbook — *Anthony Hillbruner* 94

Briefly Noted 95

Shop Talk — *Richard Murphy* 99

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLV FEBRUARY 1959 NUMBER 1

SOURCES OF THE ELOCUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND: 1700-1748

Wilbur Samuel Howell

1.

HISTORIANS of English rhetoric concur in saying that the elocutionary movement originated in England around 1750.[1] By the term "elocutionary movement" they mean, of course, the historical trend in which rhetoric as a formal discipline not only renounced her previous interest in the classical doctrines of invention, arrangement, and style, but undertook also to confine herself to the study of oratorical delivery and its twin aspects of voice and gesture. Sandford, one of the earliest of these historians, begins his account of the elocutionary movement by discussing Thomas Sheridan's *Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762) and his introductory *Discourse* which preceded the *Lectures* by three years.[2] Twenty-two years after Sandford defined these limits, Guthrie enlarged them somewhat by placing John Mason's *Essay on Elocution, or, Pronunciation* (London, 1748) at the beginning of the list of "the great English works on elocution," and by saying later that "Mason seems to have been the first writer to justify the use of the term 'elocution' in the sense of delivery."[3] Thus when Parrish remarked in 1957 that John Mason "might be regarded as the originator of the elocution movement in England,"[4] he endorsed in effect the conclusion that Guthrie had expressed, and he suggested no English writers earlier than Mason as ones to have had a direct and demonstrable influence upon Mason's pioneering work.

It is now possible to establish the English origins of the elocutionary movement at a considerably earlier date than

Mr. Howell (Ph.D., Cornell, 1931), Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Princeton and former editor (1954-56) of QJS, *is presently at work on a history of logic and rhetoric in England, 1700-1850.*

[1] See Charles A. Fritz, "From Sheridan to Rush: The Beginnings of English Elocution," *QJS*, XVI (1930), 75-88; William Phillips Sandford, *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828* (The Ohio State University, 1929), pp. 169-189; Warren Guthrie, "The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America 1635-1850—V The Elocution Movement—England," *SM*, XVIII (March, 1951), 17-30; Frederick W. Haberman, "English Sources of American Elocution," *History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies*, ed. Karl R. Wallace (New York, 1954), pp. 105-126.

[2] Sandford, pp. 170-175.

[3] Guthrie, pp. 21, 23. For an account of Mason as one of the founders of the natural method of oral reading, see Daniel E. Vandraegen, "The Natural School of Oral Reading in England, 1748-1828," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949.

[4] W. M. Parrish, "Elocution—A Definition and a Challenge," *QJS*, XLIII (1957), 2.

Sandford, Guthrie, or Parrish has indicated, and to declare that our historians as a whole have overlooked several important authors and works which Mason and Sheridan themselves would have regarded as their true and direct predecessors.

When I say this, however, I do not mean to accept Sandford's statement that Robert Robinson's *The Art of Pronuntiation* (London, 1617) was a native English influence behind the elocutionary movement of the eighteenth century, or that it has any claim whatever to be regarded as "probably the first book written in English devoted exclusively to the subject of delivery."[5] Robinson's work has nothing directly to do with the classical or elocutionary doctrine of oratorical pronunciation. It is instead a description of the art by which "the true pronuntiation of languages might be learned."[6] This art is set forth by Robinson under two headings, *"Vox Audienda,* Or The Elements of Mans *Voice,"* and *"Vox Videnda,* Which is writing, or the Characters of Mans voice." Here is his own summary of these two parts:

> In the first by certaine propositions applying my selfe to set foorth the elements and parts of the voice: In the second part appointing for euery simple sound in mans voice sundry letters and characters, that the voice being thereunto once committed may by any (who shall know the vse of them) without any other expositor or instructor be aptly and truly pronounced vpon view of the writing, how strange soeuer the language be.[7]

Needless to say, Robinson is as good as his word. His work is thus a treatise on phonetics, not rhetoric, and any attempt to associate it with the English elocutionists, except as they were generally interested in phonetics, is unjustifiable. Even in the field of phonetics, Robinson's work does not apparently have value in terms of the influence it exerted upon later phoneticians; its chief claim to recognition consists in its being "a witness to the pronunciation of the first half of the seventeenth century."[8]

My purpose in this paper is to sketch in outline the history of the elocutionary movement between 1700 and 1748 and thus to identify certain authors and works as the direct forerunners of Mason and Sheridan. In my story there will be some matters of date and authorship that have not yet been completely established beyond all doubt. But the documents with which I shall deal are solid evidences that the elocutionists had evolved their terminology and marked out their special field of activity in England almost a half-century before the date when they are supposed to have launched their movement upon its astonishing but controversial course.

2.

Before I turn to the early writers in this movement, it might be well to remind ourselves that they did what they did not only as a result of the attacks made upon English Neo-Ciceronian rhetoric of the seventeenth century but also because of the tendency of English logic in that same period to monopolize

[5] Sandford, pp. 113, 170, 195, 209. My quotation is from p. 113. Guthrie (p. 18) speaks of Robinson's work in the same way as Sandford did, but admits that he had not seen a copy of it.

[6] Robert Robinson, *The Art of Pronuntiation* (London, 1617), f.A6. Robinson's work is reproduced in *The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson,* ed. E. J. Dobson, Early English Text Society No. 238 (London, 1957), pp. 1-28, my quotation being taken from p. 6.

[7] Dobson's edition, p. 7.

[8] See E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500-1700* (Oxford, 1957), I, 214. Robinson was presumably known to Charles Hoole, the seventeenth-century schoolmaster, and his *Art of Pronuntiation* is listed in Robert Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica;* see Dobson, *English Pronunciation,* I, 200-201. Otherwise Robinson does not appear to have attracted attention until recently.

functions formerly shared between herself and rhetoric. Thus a few words upon these matters will best set the stage for the developments to be explained in the central sections of this paper.

As we know, the Neo-Ciceronian school of rhetorical theory gradually supplanted that of the Ramists in the period between 1620 and 1700 and reestablished as the four components of rhetoric the classical doctrines of invention, arrangement, style, and delivery.[9] The word style in this sequence was an English equivalent of the Latin term *elocutio,* and, to the Neo-Ciceronians as to the ancients, *elocutio* referred to the problem of wording a discourse, whereas they designated the problem of oral presentation by the Latin terms *pronuntiatio* or *actio.* The chief English members of the Neo-Ciceronian school were Thomas Vicars, Thomas Farnaby, William Pemble, and Obadiah Walker, all of whom dealt with the four components just mentioned. Lesser figures were John Smith, Thomas Blount, William Prideaux, and John Bulwer, who contributed treatises on separate components of the whole Neo-Ciceronian system, Smith, Blount, and Prideaux being authors of works on style, and Bulwer, of a work on gesture or "the Art of Manvall Rhetoricke."[10] All together, these eight major and minor figures were the dominant rhetoricians of their century, and for a large part of the era they had things more or less their own way.

But, as the century advanced, powerful opposition began to develop against certain traditional elements in logic and rhetoric. The Port-Royalists in their vastly popular *Logique* (1662), and Bernard Lamy in his *Rhétorique* (1675), attacked the classical system that provided for the invention of ideas by a resort to the commonplaces.[11] When these two works became popular in England soon after their publication in France, they caused English logicians and rhetoricians to lose some of their confidence in the traditional machinery of *inventio* as it had been stated and taught by Vicars and Farnaby.[12] This crisis in confidence was intensified by Locke's influential theory that our knowledge comes to us from sensation and reflection, and that the study of objective reality is therefore the true source of ideas in the acquisition or transmission of learning and opinion.[13] Meanwhile, powerful spokesmen of the new science like Robert Boyle and Thomas Sprat subjected the doctrine of *elocutio* or style to a scorching attack. Boyle convincingly declared that the classical Roman conception of style had been

[9] For a full discussion of Neo-Ciceronian rhetoric of the seventeenth century see my *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (Princeton, 1956), pp. 318-341. Memory also figured as a major component of the rhetorical theory of Cicero and Quintilian, but it tended to be detached from classical theory as interpreted by several of the leading rhetoricians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thus I am not considering it as part of my present argument.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 276-279, 332-334, 340-341.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 355-357, 380-381.

[12] In its abridged as distinguished from its complete text published at Oxford in 1691, Henry Aldrich's *Artis Logicae Compendium* contains not only a scathing denunciation of the Port-Royalists (sig. G4v-H2r) but also a reverent endorsement of the full outline of traditional logic; and this work was often reprinted in England during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But except for it, logical theory of that period did not treat the commonplaces kindly. For a typical view, see Jean Pierre de Crousaz, *A New Treatise of the Art of Thinking,* [trans. John Henley] (London, 1724), II, 215-223. Incidentally, Henley's right to be called the translator of this work has been overlooked by library cataloguers, but I feel that the translation is his. See the pamphlet, *Books Written, and Publish'd, By the Reverend John Henley, M. A.* (London, 1724), p. 12.

[13] For examples of the influence of this view upon English logical theory, see Isaac Watts, *Logick* (London, 1725), p. 47; also William Duncan, *The Elements of Logick,* in Robert Dodsley, *The Preceptor* (London, 1748), II, 9-11, 121.

uncritically accepted as the only standard of eloquence in the modern world, whereas that standard did not wholly explain the eloquence of the Scriptures or of other works in the non-Roman tradition.[14] Somewhat later, Sprat pointed out with caustic emphasis that the traditional tropes and figures of rhetoric were of little value in solving the problem of communication between scientist and scientist or between scientist and public, and thus would have to be abandoned in scientific exposition.[15]

While the late seventeenth century was making these devastating criticisms of traditional invention and style as concepts in rhetoric, the theory of rhetorical arrangement was being taught by logic. Ramus, it will be recalled, had transferred the theory of arrangement from rhetoric to dialectic, and in the great reaction against him towards the end of the seventeenth century, this was one of his reforms which English logicians allowed to remain in force.[16] Method or disposition or arrangement became a standard part of logical doctrine between 1600 and 1700, and in all logics of the period method meant in large part the theory of organizing discourses for the communication of ideas. This trend continued during the eighteenth century. One has only to read the logics of Aldrich, Crousaz, Watts, and Duncan, who best represent the major trends in English logical theory for the first half of that period, to see that the classical doctrine of rhetorical disposition was to a large extent being superseded and made obsolete by what logic had to say upon the subject of arranging treatises for the purpose of exposition and argumentation.

Faced with open attacks upon two important aspects of their doctrine and with the threat of having a third aspect stolen completely, some eighteenth-century rhetoricians through inertia or indifference pretended that nothing had happened and that the traditional doctrines were still valid. Thus they constructed rhetorics upon the four chief terms of Ciceronian theory, as did John Holmes in *The Art of Rhetoric Made Easy*,[17] or they wrote treatises which covered *elocutio* and thus dealt with the tropes and figures, as did Nicholas Burton, Thomas Gibbons, Daniel Turner, and Anthony Blackwall.[18] These writers did not have a great influence in their time, but they have to be mentioned as unreconstructed followers of the conservative doctrines of the seventeenth-century Neo-Ciceronians.

Meanwhile, other rhetoricians of the eighteenth century sought to revise and reinterpret Ciceronian theory so as to answer on the one hand the criticisms that had been leveled at the traditional systems of invention and style, and on the other to preserve the precepts of rhetorical arrangement against further

[14] See Robert Boyle, *Some Considerations Touching the Style of the H. Scriptures* (London, 1659), pp. 158-170.

[15] See Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Royal-Society of London* (London, 1667), pp. 111-113.

[16] For details, see Howell, pp. 146-172, 282-317.

[17] Published at London in 1739 and reissued in 1755, 1789, and 1807.

[18] Nicholas Burton, *Figurae Grammaticae et Rhetoricae* (London, 1702); Thomas Gibbons, *Rhetoric; or, a View of its principal Tropes and Figures* (London, 1767); Daniel Turner, *An Introduction to Rhetoric; containing all the Tropes and Figures in English Verse* (Abingdon, 1771); Anthony Blackwall, *An Introduction to the Classics . . . With an Essay, on the Nature and Use of those Emphatical and Beautiful Figures which give Strength and Ornament to Writing* (London, 1718). Blackwall's treatise on the figures went through six editions by 1748 in the form just indicated. Then it was taken over and published by Robert Dodsley in *The Preceptor*, where it had editions in 1748, 1754, and 1763. Titled *Rhetoric and Poetry: Extracted from the Preceptor, for the Use of the University in Cambridge*, it was given an edition at Boston in 1796.

encroachments by logic. These writers produced the great rhetorical works of their time, and chief among them are Ward, Priestley, Campbell, and Blair. They were by no means in conformity with each other in regard to the main divisions and the contents of their rhetorical doctrine, but they were basically agreed that much in the great tradition of Cicero and Quintilian was worthy of preservation and capable of adaptation to the needs of the modern world.

The English elocutionists chose still another direction. Feeling that the classical theory of invention had been largely replaced by the new theories of knowledge, that contemporary logics were doing an adequate job with the doctrine of arrangement, and that the day of the tropes and figures was probably over so far as schoolroom instruction in style was concerned, the elocutionists decided to concentrate their energies upon *pronuntiatio,* which was the only part of the traditional scheme to have been spared from attack in the seventeenth century. Thus they occupied what appeared to be the strongest defensive position that remained to classical rhetoric.

But they decided to give that position a new name, and the name that they chose was elocution. Even before the formal beginning of their movement, however, there was an English precedent for calling oral presentation in rhetoric by this new name rather than by the more obvious and more traditional name of pronunciation or action. So far as a treatise on rhetoric is concerned, that precedent was at least as old as John Wilkins's *Ecclesiastes, or, A discourse concerning the Gift of Preaching.* Originally published at London in 1646, and given six later editions before 1700, this treatise divided its doctrine into three headings, that is, Method, Matter, and Expression, and when it came to speak of Expression, it first discussed "Phrase," and secondly, "Eloquution."[19] There can be no doubt that "Phrase" designates for Wilkins what the ancient rhetoricians had called *elocutio,* and that "Eloquution" designates for him what the ancients had called *pronuntiatio* or *actio,* and what we today call rhetorical delivery. "The *phrase,*" he says, "should be plain, full, wholesome, affectionate,"[20] and these four terms provide the framework for his discussion of the problem of wording in sermon-making. As for the problem of oral presentation, Wilkins briefly develops the single thesis that "In the elocution there are two extremities to be avoided: too much Boldnesse, Fear,"[21] and these two qualities as Wilkins explains them refer to the speaker's attitude as it is reflected in his voice and bearing. Wilkins concludes his discussion of these qualities by saying, "In brief, the most proper manner of eloquution is with modesty and gravity, which will best sute with our calling and businesse."[22]

3.

The English elocutionary movement thus received its distinctive English name from native sources, but it bor-

[19] See *Ecclesiastes, or, A discourse concerning the Gift of Preaching As it fals under the Rules of Art . . . ,* The third Edition (London, 1651), pp. 5, 128-133. I have not as yet seen the first edition.

A New English Dictionary, s. v. Elocution, gives Robert Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall, containing and teaching the true writing and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English Words,* 3rd ed. (London, 1613), as the earliest English work to define elocution as delivery. The next instance listed in the *NED* is dated 1678.

[20] *Ecclesiastes,* p. 128.

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 132.

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 133. For a full discussion of the shift of the term elocution from the context of style to that of delivery, see Frederick W. Haberman, "The Elocutionary Movement in England, 1750-1850," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1947, Ch. III.

rowed its first doctrines from a Frenchman. This Frenchman is to be identified as Michel Le Faucheur. Born in Geneva in the late fifteen hundreds, Le Faucheur became a Protestant preacher and theologian, and for much of his life occupied pulpits with considerable distinction at Montpellier and Charenton. At the time of his death at Paris in 1657, he had already published a few religious works, and was the author of an unpublished essay, the *Traitté de l'action de l'orateur, ou de la Prononciation et du geste,* which was seen through the press that very year by Valentin Conrart.[23] This work received several editions in French before the end of the seventeenth century, and in 1690 at Helmstedt it was published in Melchior Schmidt's Latin version, thus being made available to the entire European world of learning. Some dozen years after this latter event, it was given an anonymous English translation and was published at London under the title, *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator; As To His Pronunciation & Gesture. Useful both for Divines and Lawyers, and necessary for all Young Gentlemen, that study now to Speak well in Publick.*[24] In 1727 this same translation was given another printing at London, its title being altered to read *The Art of Speaking in Publick: or an Essay on the Action of an Orator; As to his Pronunciation and Gesture. Useful in the Senate or Theatre, the Court, the Camp, as well as the Bar and Pulpit. The Second Edition Corrected. With an Introduction relating to the Famous Mr. Henly's present Oratory.*[25] Twenty-three years later, in 1750, this translation was given a third edition and was now called *An Essay upon Pronunciation and Gesture, Founded Upon the Best Rules and Authorities of the Ancients, Ecclesiastical and Civil, and Adorned with the Finest Rules of Elocution.*[26]

The date of the first publication of this English translation is the date when the English elocutionary movement formally began, and the name of the translator is that of the English founder of the movement. It is exasperating, therefore, to be forced to confess that the translator does not identify himself and that the first edition does not proclaim its date of publication. To be sure, John Henley is credited with being the author of the edition published in 1727,[27] but a mere reading of "The Editor's Introduction and Apology for this Edition," as contained in the work, promptly dispels any thought that Henley had anything to do with it, except as the unwilling victim of the editor's hostility. So far as I know, there is at present no firm clue to the identity of the editor of the second edition, or of the single translator of the three editions. But there is a way to be sure that the first edition was published early in the eighteenth century, probably in the year 1702, although this statement contradicts the accepted belief that it ap-

[23] See *Biographie Universelle,* s. v. Le Faucheur, Michel; *Nouvelle Biographie Générale,* s. v. Le Faucheur, Michel. I have not seen the first edition of his *Traitté de l'action de l'orateur;* the title as I give it comes from the *Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale.*

[24] The title page continues: "Done out of *French. Aliud est eloquentiam callere; aliud, eloqui.* London: Printed for *Nich. Cox* at the *Golden Bible* without *Temple-Barr.*" No date is given. There is no mention in the work that Le Faucheur is author.

[25] The title page continues: "*Aliud est Eloquentiam callere. Aliud est Eloqui.* London: Printed for N. Cox, in *Story's Passage, Westminster,* and sold by him and the Booksellers in *London, Oxford,* and *Cambridge.* 1727."

[26] The title page continues: "London: Printed for C. Hitch, in *Paternoster-row.* MDCCL."

[27] See *Dictionary of National Biography,* s. v. Henley, John, where the translation of Le Faucheur's work is treated as if it were an original work by Henley, and no first edition of it is mentioned.

peared around 1680.[28] Here are the chief items of evidence to support the eighteenth-century date.

For one thing, the second edition, which, I repeat, was published in 1727, speaks of the first edition as "having been buried upwards of twenty Years in the most profound *Silence* and *Oblivion.*"[29] This statement points to the first decade of the eighteenth century as the date of publication of the first edition, and leaves us only the problem of deciding whether some one year in that decade has any special claim above another as the time when the work appeared. For another thing, the first edition is dedicated "*To the Honoured* Christopher Rawlinson, *Esquire,*" and the dedicatory letter compliments Rawlinson on the honorable part he has played in the commonwealth of learning.[30] It plainly appears that this compliment is a reference to Rawlinson's only literary endeavor, his edition of King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius's *Consolationis Philosophiae Libri V,* which was published at Oxford in 1698; and if it is such a reference, then the dedicatory letter was probably written not more than three or four years after Rawlinson's own work came out. For still another thing, the translator's Preface to the Reader, as contained in the first edition, confesses "that this *English Translation* of that *Tract,* is wholly owing to the extraordinary character, which the Incomparable Sir Roger L'Estrange and the Reverend Dr. Wake have been pleased to give it";[31] but "The Editor's Introduction and Apology," as contained in the second edition, changes this particular passage to read "the incomparable Sir *Roger L'Estrange,* and *his Grace the present Arch-bishop of Canterbury,* when Preacher to the *Honourable Society of Gray's Inn.*"[32] Dr. Wake is the person indicated along with L'Estrange in both of these references. He was preacher at Gray's Inn between 1688 and 1695; he was canon of Christ Church between 1689 and 1702; he became dean of Exeter in 1703, and held that office until 1705; and after that, he was successively Bishop of Lincoln and Archbishop of Canterbury.[33] The printed reference to him as "the Reverend Dr. Wake" would most probably have been made only at that time in his career when he did not have any special title that the public mention of him should in propriety include; and that time may be identified as the latter part of the year 1702, when the sole office he held was that of rector of St. James's in Westminster. No doubt as a young preacher at Gray's Inn between 1688 and 1695 he had recommended Le Faucheur's *Traitté* to one of his friends as being something that should be translated into English; and that friend in the course of a few years did the translation and published it, mentioning Dr. Wake only by the title that applied to him at the moment of its publication. Thus there is a strong probability that the first edition came from the press in 1702. The rival date, 1680, is impossible on all counts, and agrees with none of the available pieces of evidence that I have pointed out. For example, the Christopher Rawlinson to whom the first edition is dedicated, and who is mentioned as a person of some learning

[28] See Donald Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue,* s. v. Le Faucher [*sic*], Michel. Wing follows the dating of the work as given in *The British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books,* and in the catalogues of other libraries.

[29] *The Art of Speaking in Publick,* p. xi.

[30] *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* sig. A2r-A5v.

[31] *Ibid.,* sig. A6v-A7r.

[32] *The Art of Speaking in Publick,* p. xii.

[33] *Dictionary of National Biography,* s. v. Wake, William.

at the time when the dedication is being written, would have been only three years of age in 1680, and thus at that moment ineligible for special claims to erudition.[34]

Le Faucheur's *Traitté* is one of the most respectable works of scholarship in the whole elocutionary movement and one of the finest treatises on delivery in the history of rhetorical theory. The same comments apply to the English version, which unfortunately can receive only a brief description in this paper.

Early in his first chapter Le Faucheur remarks that "the *Great Masters* of *Rhetorick* have set up *Invention, Disposition,* and *Elocution* for the three first parts of Oratory,"[35] but that later, in recognition of the influence of the passions in human affairs, they added a fourth part, action, "which consists of *Speaking* and *Gesture,*" and which Demosthenes rated as the first, the second, and the third of the important parts of oratory, as did Cicero.[36] In making action the subject of his own treatise, Le Faucheur devotes his first three chapters to general considerations affecting it. Then he turns to speaking or using the voice, and for the next eight chapters he successively analyzes the problems of being heard without difficulty, of being heard with delight, and of varying the voice in respect to the necessary degree of loudness, vehemence, and speed, in respect to the different kinds of subjects, to the different passions, to the different parts of the classical oration, to the various important figures of rhetoric, and to the different kinds of sentences and words. His next two chapters discuss gesture first in general and then as it relates to the various parts of the body, particularly the head, face, eyes, and hands. In dealing with the latter topic, he enumerates seventeen rules for the use of the hand in gesturing. He concludes his work with a fourteenth chapter on the application of all the preceding precepts to the speaker's actual practice. Throughout the entire treatise, Le Faucheur keeps ancient illustrations and ancient doctrine continuously before his readers' eyes, except for the mention of a few modern parallels. Thus Demosthenes, Cicero, Quintilian, and St. Augustine provide examples of difficulties overcome, or their doctrines are quoted to teach the proper management of voice and body, while Philostratus, Plutarch, Aristotle, Isocrates, and others are mentioned from time to time.

It is curious to see in the first edition of this translation that the English terminology gives the translator a certain amount of trouble. In general he uses the word elocution to mean style, and the word pronunciation or action to mean delivery, as we gather from the passage quoted just above.[37] Indeed, these terms are authorized by Le Faucheur's French text, even if the translator had not had Latin theory in mind. But every now and then, as if to offer evidence that the word elocution, as used in the context of the theory of rhetoric, is transferring itself from the realm of style to the realm of delivery, the translator uses it in this latter sense. Thus in speaking of the habit of articulating words with an open mouth, he reproduces Le Faucheur's advice about correcting the fault, adding, "And where's the Elocution of unintelligible *Gibberidge*?"[38] Thus also, in beginning

[34] *Dictionary of National Biography,* s. v. Rawlinson, Christopher (1677-1733).

[35] *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* p. 2.

[36] *Ibid.,* p. 2.

[37] For other examples, see *ibid.,* pp. 47, 78, 126.

[38] *Ibid.,* p. 63.

the chapter on varying the voice according to the different kinds of subjects, he makes the French text say that the speaker must be able not only to manage his voice in general but also to follow particular rules "for all the *changes* and *variations* of the Voyce that are necessary to set-off his Discourse with a *taking Air* of Elocution, according to the quality of the *Subjects* he treats of, the nature of the *Passions* he would shew in *himself* or raise in *others*, the several parts of his *Discourse*, the different *Figures* he makes use of, and the *variety* of his *words* and his *Phrase*."[39] In these two passages, elocution means delivery rather than style, and there are other examples of the same kind in this translation,[40] despite its tendency to preserve the older usage.

4.

Le Faucheur had intended his *Traitté* to be useful primarily to the pulpit and the bar, and this fact is stressed on the title page of its first edition in English. But in its second edition in English, the title page enlarges its sphere of usefulness to include the senate, the theatre, the court, and the camp as well. Lest these new-found beneficiaries be regarded merely as the brain children of promoters bent upon improving the sale of their product, I should like to say that long before 1727 the English version of the *Traitté* had been adapted to the uses of the theatre. In fact, in the book which I am about to discuss, it had been paid the compliment of having been extensively plagiarized and applied to the art of acting.

That treatise, published at London in 1710, is by Charles Gildon, and its title I shall quote in full, precisely because the first part of it seems to indicate that a distinguished actor rather than the art of acting is under consideration in the ensuing work. The title reads thus:

The Life of Mr. *Thomas Betterton*, The late Eminent Tragedian. Wherein The Action and Utterance of the *Stage*, *Bar*, and *Pulpit*, are distinctly consider'd. With The Judgment of the late Ingenious *Monsieur de St. Evremond*, upon the *Italian* and *French* Music and Opera's; in a Letter to the Duke of *Buckingham*. To which is added, The Amorous Widow, or the *Wanton Wife*. A Comedy. Written by Mr. Betterton. Now first printed from the Original Copy. . . . London: Printed for Robert Gosling, at the *Mitre*, near the *Inner-Temple Gate* in *Fleetstreet*. 1710.[41]

Despite the opening words of this title (and they are the words that become in bibliographical abridgments the only clue to the contents of the work), we have here no proper life of Thomas Betterton. We do have the text of his play, *The Amorous Widow*. Before that, exclusive of front matter, we have a work of 176 pages made up as follows: there is first a four-page introduction promising a biography of Betterton and a set of his precepts on acting;[42] there is next a six-page sketch of Betterton's life;[43] then there is a 163-page work devoted to the precepts of action and utterance on the stage, and to some critical observations on dancing, music, and opera, these two sections being faintly modeled upon Cicero's *De Oratore*;[44] and finally there is a three-page list of plays in which Betterton had acted.[45] I shall deal here only with that part which concerns action and utterance; but even so, I shall be concerning myself with some 126 pages of the work.

The precepts on action and utterance grow out of a dialogue represented to

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.
[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 96, 117-118, 211.

[41] In some copies of this work, the dedicatory letter to Richard Steele is signed "Charles Gildon," and this establishes Gildon's authorship. In other copies the letter is unsigned.
[42] Charles Gildon, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* (London, 1710), pp. 1-4.
[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-11.
[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-174.
[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 174-176.

have taken place at Betterton's country house in Reading between the distinguished actor himself and two friends who had called upon him.[46] The dialogue opens as the three men retire to the garden after having dined together. They fall into a discussion of famous actors and actresses and of the art of the stage, and Betterton is soon prevailed upon to deal at length with this latter subject. He consents only because he happens to have on hand a manuscript on acting by a friend of his; and he proceeds to read aloud what the friend had written,[47] and to incorporate into this reading two shorter papers by two other friends.[48]

After some comment upon the conduct of actors and actresses in their private lives, the first manuscript takes up a player's conduct upon the stage and discusses his gesture and his speaking. Hamlet's advice to the players is mentioned several times in the following pages, and is quoted and admired;[49] moreover, Francis Bacon and a person identified only as a learned countryman are noticed;[50] but by and large this manuscript is made up of doctrine gathered from the English version of Le Faucheur's *Traitté,* from Julius Pollux's *Onomasticum Graece & Latine,* and from Louis Crésol's *Vacationes Autumnales,* which is a 706-page Latin treatise on the subject of oratorical pronunciation and gesture.

In a way, Gildon acknowledges that his treatise on acting is founded upon these sources. Thus when Betterton interrupts his reading of the first manuscript to introduce a few comments written by another friend, it is he who acknowledges that these latter come from Pollux.[51] Thus when he interrupts himself on an earlier occasion to introduce a special section written by still another friend, he identifies it as having come from the pages of "a learned Jesuit,"[52] and it is this author who can be positively identified as Crésol.[53] Moreover, Gildon takes the trouble to tell his readers that he would not have bothered them with a preface except "to prevent an Objection, which may be made, and that is, that I have been a *Plagiary,* and deliver'd Rules for my own, which are taken out of other Authors." He adds:

> I first allow, that I have borrow'd many of them from the *French,* but then the *French* drew most of them from *Quintilian* and other Authors. Yet the *Frenchman* has improv'd the Ancients in this Particular, by supplying what was lost by the Alteration of Custom, with Observations more peculiar to the present Age.[54]

[46] *Ibid.,* p. 11.

[47] *Ibid.,* pp. 17-18. Actually this manuscript, as Betterton's companions observe, is in "his own Hand." But we should not therefore conclude that Betterton is its author. See below, note 64. We should understand instead that Gildon is making Betterton the author as a dramatic device to emphasize the great actor's known personal modesty.

[48] *Ibid.,* pp. 43-48, 89-97.

[49] *Ibid.,* pp. 23-24, 38, 70-71, 81-84, 87.

[50] *Ibid.,* pp. 29-30, 32-33.

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 89.

[52] *Ibid.,* pp. 43, 48.

[53] Compare Gildon, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton,* with Louis Crésol, *Vacationes Autumnales sive De Perfecta Oratoris Actione et Pronunciatione Libri III* (Paris, 1620), as follows:

For Gildon, p. 43, lines 17-23, see Crésol, p. 134, lines 3-7.
For Gildon, p. 43, lines 24-29, see Crésol, p. 109, lines 11-18.
For Gildon, p. 43, lines 30-32, see Crésol, p. 105, lines 19-22.
For Gildon, p. 44, lines 4-9, see Crésol, p. 162, lines 12-15, 17-22.
For Gildon, p. 45, lines 30-32, see Crésol, p. 367, lines 19-23.
For Gildon, p. 46, lines 1-3, see Crésol, p. 374, lines 6-10.
For Gildon, p. 46, lines 18-31, see Crésol, p. 317, lines 15-21.
For Gildon, p. 47, lines 1-2, see Crésol, p. 317, lines 15-21.

Gildon's borrowings from Crésol amount to 163 lines of text. Crésol's own discussion of the subjects from which those lines are taken amounts to some 13,000 lines of text. Thus the table just given by no means locates all of the passages Gildon used. More work is needed on this problem.

[54] *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton,* pp. ix-x.

Thus it could be argued that Gildon does not indulge in unacknowledged borrowing, and that even his use of Le Faucheur is acknowledged far enough to prevent a charge of plagiarism against him.

But in actual fact Gildon makes heavy and unacknowledged borrowings not from Le Faucheur's *Traitté* but from the English translation of it.[55] Some of his borrowings can be identified as verbal echoes of the translation;[56] some, as the adaptation of the translation's doctrine to the particular needs of the actor;[57] and some, as the outright use of passages copied from the translation almost verbatim. Here are examples of this last kind of borrowing:

Gildon: *Pericles,* tho 'tis said he had the Goddess Persuasion on his Lips, and that he thundred and lightned in an Assembly, and made all *Greece* tremble when he spoke, yet would never publish any of his Orations, because their Excellency lay in the Action.[58]

Le Faucheur's Translator: *Pericles,* for all the *Poets* said that the *Goddess of Persuasion* sat upon his *Lipps;* that he *thunder'd* and *lighten'd* in an Assembly, and made all *Greece* tremble again when he *Spake;* never made any of his *Orations* Publick: For why, *says one,* their Excellency lay in the Action. . . .[59]

Gildon: The *Mouth* must never be writh'd, nor the *Lips* bit or lick'd, which are all ungenteel and unmannerly Actions, and yet what some are frequently guilty of.[60]

Le Faucheur's Translator: As for the *Mouth,* you must never *wry* it at all; for that's very *disagreeable.* . . . As for your *Lips,* you must take care not to *bite* 'em, nor to *lick* 'em with your *Tongue;* as I have seen some People do sometimes; Which is very *Ungenteel* and *Unmannerly* in an *Orator.*[61]

Gildon: There are, in short, two things to make the Speaker heard and understood without Difficulty; first, a very distinct and articulate Voice, and next a very strong and vigorous Pronunciation. The first is the most important; for an indifferent Voice, with a distinct Pronunciation, shall be far more easily understood, than one, that is stronger and more audible, but which does not articulate the Words so well.[62]

Le Faucheur's Translator: *First,* there are two things requisite to qualify a Man for this Work: That is, a very *Distinct* and *Articulate Voyce* and a very *Strong* and *Vigorous Pronunciation;* but the *former* is the more important and necessary of the *Two.* For a Man that has only an *indifferent Voyce,* if his *Pronunciation* be but Distinct, he shall be understood with far more ease than another that has a stronger and more Audible Faculty of *Speaking,* but does not *articulate* his words so well.[63]

Before we take leave of Gildon's *Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton,* we must observe that some of what it says on stage history, and much of what it says on stage gesture, appear almost verbatim later in the eighteenth century in a

[55] Gildon, pp. 28, 31, makes veiled references to suggest his dependence upon a translation, but they hardly suffice as adequate acknowledgments of his large debt to the specific translation he used.

[56] Compare Gildon's text with that of *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* as follows: p. 26 with p. 172; p. 26 with pp. 39-55; pp. 26-27 with pp. 39, 54-55; p. 27 with pp. 58, 175; p. 28 with pp. 115-116.

[57] Compare Gildon's text with that of *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* as follows: pp. 33-34 with pp. 173-177; p. 51 with pp. 171-172; p. 57 with p. 178; p. 78 with p. 202.

[58] Gildon, p. 32.

[59] *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* p. 6.

[60] Gildon, p. 72.

[61] *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* pp. 192-193.

[62] Gildon, p. 101.

[63] *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator,* pp. 64-65.

work called *The History of the English Stage* (London, 1741), attributed on its title page to Betterton, but more properly regarded as a miscellany compiled by Edmund Curll. This work runs to 167 pages, 66 of which can be positively identified with pages that Gildon had written himself or borrowed from the English version of Le Faucheur.[64] With his eye fixed upon human weaknesses, Curll distributed these 66 pages in such fashion that sections of doctrine on stage action preceded and followed sections devoted to episodes in theatre history or to accounts of the lives and loves of famous actors and actresses. Curll omits almost everything that Gildon had said on utterance or voice,[65] which had been Le Faucheur's most important topic, and which Gildon had treated as subordinate to gesture. But Curll gives most of Gildon's (and many of Le Faucheur's) precepts on gesture, thus making it possible for us to say that well before 1750 elocutionary doctrine in England had appeared twice in the context of the art of acting.

5.

The next episode, and a crucial one, in the early history of this doctrine in England concerns an anonymous pamphlet entitled *Some Rules for Speaking and Action; To be observed At the Bar, in the Pulpit, and the Senate, and by every one that Speaks in Publick.* This work was first published at London in August or September of 1715, and had an immediate run of popularity, with the result that it reached a third edition by the following February, and had two later editions by 1750.[66] I do not know where a copy of its first edition can be located. My present discussion is based upon the third edition, a copy of which is held by the Huntington Library. That copy contains 32 pages, and is made up of a short Preface, a section called "The Portraiture of a Compleat Orator," a passage "Out of Bishop Sprat's Charge to his Clergy," another passage "Out of Bishop Burnet's Pastoral Care," and an unsigned Letter dated Feb. 4, 1715-16, and headed "Some Rules for Speaking and Action." The Preface is brief enough to be quoted in full:

> This Letter was writ and printed about Six Months ago at the Request of a *Friend;* and the *Bookseller* being now about Publishing another Edition, and desiring me to give him what farther *Collections* I have made; I have prefix'd to it, *The Portraiture of a Compleat Orator,* which is agreeable enough to the Let-

[64] The following sections of Curll's *The History of the English Stage* and of Gildon's *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* may be examined for evidence that this statement is true:
Ch. I (pp. 5-12) of Curll is drawn from Gildon, pp. 2, 5-10.
Ch. II (pp. 13-31) of Curll is partly drawn from Gildon, pp. 13-17.
Ch. IV (pp. 36-54) of Curll is drawn from Gildon, pp. 23-40.
Ch. V (pp. 55-78) of Curll is partly drawn from Gildon, pp. 41-55.
Ch. VI (pp. 79-110) of Curll is partly drawn from Gildon, pp. 57-68, 71-84.
The fact that Curll's *History*, p. 36, attributes its fourth chapter to "Mr. *Betterton's* Papers" has led to the conclusion that Curll's treatment of stage gesture is taken directly from the notes of the famous actor himself. For endorsement of this conclusion see *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, II, 403. But such an opinion appears to have nothing to support it except for Curll's words as just quoted, and they, of course, are based upon Gildon's assertion in the *Life* that the manuscript read by Betterton was in his own hand. See above, note 47. Once we recognize that Curll was borrowing from Gildon, and that Gildon in turn was borrowing from the English version of Le Faucheur, the theory that the ideas are Betterton's evaporates.
Alan S. Downer, "Nature to Advantage Dressed: Eighteenth-Century Acting," PMLA, LVIII (1943), 1007, 1031-1032, was I believe the first to note that Curll's *History* borrows much of its material from Gildon's *Life*. The connection between Gildon and Le Faucheur seems not to have been pointed out until now.

[65] Of the four pages assigned by Curll to voice or speaking, all are given over to reproducing Gildon's quotation and discussion of Hamlet's advice to the players. See Curll, *The History of the English Stage*, pp. 106-110.

[66] See *The British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*, s. v. Rules (col. 128).

ter, as taken from *Quintilian*, and an *Epitome* of what the Bishops *Sprat* and *Burnet*, the one the *English Cicero*, the other one of the greatest Orators of the Age, have written upon this Subject. What other *Observations* I have since made, are inserted in the Letter; and indeed I should have digested what is prefix'd into the same Method, but only I thought there was no Occasion to be nicely Methodical in such a short Discourse, and which consists wholly of Hints and Sketches. I *submit* it to the World as it is, and shall be glad to see it *mended*.

As these words indicate, the author of the pamphlet considers that his own contribution to his subject is contained in his Letter on speaking and action. When we turn to it, we find that it begins on a note of apology for the author's unfitness, and that it declares his intention of relying only upon what others have said.[67] He later adds that his Letter is an epitome of volumes.[68] Despite this amiable pretension, however, he depends completely upon the first edition of the English version of Le Faucheur's *Traitté*, as a reading of the two works will reveal to anyone interested.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of *Some Rules for Speaking and Action*, apart from its connection with Le Faucheur's influence upon the early history of the elocutionary movement in England, is that it gets cited in John Mason's *An Essay on Elocution, or, Pronunciation*,[69] and thus it can be established as a source of what has hitherto been regarded as itself the main foundation and source of English elocutionary theory. That Mason relies upon the first or second edition of the English version of Le Faucheur can also be demonstrated. For example, Mason's discussion of the problem of varying the voice according to the passions and according to the parts of an oration has a clear source in Le Faucheur and his translator,[70] but it is not supported by anything in *Some Rules for Speaking and Action*.

6.

The closing episode of my present story concerns John Henley, who attracted more attention to the elocutionary movement than did anyone else of his time. Henley styled himself, in fact, the *"restorer of the ancient elocution,"* as Ephriam Chambers noted in 1738 in the second of many editions of his vastly popular *Cyclopaedia*; but, adds Chambers, Mr. Henley is confused when he uses the term elocution in this sense, and he means rather to call himself the restorer "of the ancient *pronunciation*."[71] Henley was still living when Chambers thus recognized and corrected his title to fame, and it is no small accomplishment for a living man to be mentioned in this special way in an important reference work, even with a rebuke implied in the notoriety.

Henley is also known to fame as Orator Henley.[72] Son of the vicar of Melton Mowbray and grandson of the vicar of the same parish on his mother's side, Henley was born in 1692 and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He became a schoolmaster in his native village, where, says his biographer, Mr.

[67] *Some Rules for Speaking and Action*, The Third Edition (London, 1716), p. 20.

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 29-31.

[69] *An Essay on Elocution, or, Pronunciation. Intended chiefly for the Assistance of those who instruct others in the Art of Reading. And of those who are often called to speak in Publick* (London: Printed for M. Cooper, at the Globe in Paternoster Row, 1748), p. 27.

[70] Compare *An Essay on Elocution, or, Pronunciation*, pp. 23-26, with *An Essay Upon The Action of an Orator*, pp. 97-118, 119-127.

[71] Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopaedia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, The Second Edition (London, 1738), s. v. Pronunciation. The italics are Chambers's.

[72] See *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v. Henley, John.

Welstede, he established the "Practice of improving Elocution by the publick Speaking of Passages in the Classicks, Morning and Afternoon, as well as Orations, &c."[73] During this time he began an extensive work on universal grammar, refused an invitation to apply for a fellowship at his college in Cambridge, wrote a historical poem called *Esther,* was ordained deacon by Dr. Wake (who figures earlier in this present paper), and, after receiving his M.A. in 1716, was admitted into the clergy of the Anglican Church. Successful at once as a preacher, and ambitious to succeed in this new career, he went to London equipped with thirty letters of recommendation, "and preach'd more Charity-Sermons about Town, was more numerously followed, and raised more for the poor children at those Sermons than any other Preacher, however dignify'd, or distinguish'd."[74] In delivering these sermons, Henley placed open stress upon proper utterance and gesture, influenced no doubt by the popularity of such treatises as the English translation of Le Faucheur, Gildon's misnamed *Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton,* and the anonymous pamphlet, *Some Rules for Speaking and Action.* At this same era of his life, Henley did a considerable amount of literary work. He published translations of Pliny the Younger's *Epistles* and *Panegyric,* of various works of René Vertot, of Montfaucon's *Diarium Italicum,* of Jean Pierre de Crousaz's *Logique,* and of Addison's Latin poems. He also edited *The Works of Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1724-25).[75]

But his growing reputation as preacher, his obvious concern for success, his introduction of elocutionary techniques into his sermons, and his literary exertions, began to tell against him. Mr. Welstede says that Henley's "Popularity, with his enterprizing Spirit, and introducing regular Action into the Pulpit, were the true Causes, why some obstructed his rising in Town, from Envy, Jealousy, and a Disrelish of those who are not qualify'd to be compleat Spaniels."[76] There is also a possibility, not mentioned by Welstede, that Henley's career in the Anglican establishment was impaired by rumors of his having been forced to leave Melton Mowbray because of a scandal linking him to a married woman, Mrs. Tolson, who was subsequently alleged to have followed him to London and to have passed as his wife.[77] At any rate, about the year 1724 Henley was relieved of his ecclesiastical duties in London and tossed "into a country-Benefice by the Way of the Sea, as far as *Galilee* of the *Gentiles.*"[78] Not in the mood to endure this exile from town, Henley gave up his country benefice and his career in the established church, returning to London to open on July 3, 1726, in quarters above the market house in Newport Market, an institution which he called The Oratory.

The Oratory had two aspects, one religious and the other secular.[79] On the former side its practices rested upon the legal right of private judgment in re-

[73] John Henley, *Oratory Transactions, No. I* (London, 1728), p. 5. This quotation occurs in connection with a biographical sketch of Henley included in *Oratory Transactions, No. I* and attributed to "Mr. *Welstede.*" Welstede is said in T. F. Henderson's account of Henley in *Dictionary of National Biography* to be no doubt Henley himself.

[74] *Oratory Transactions, No. I,* p. 12.

[75] See *Books Written, and Publish'd, By the Reverend John Henley, M.A.* (London, 1724), pp. 5-15. See also *Oratory Transactions, No. I,* p. 12.

[76] *Oratory Transactions, No. I,* p. 12.

[77] See William Whiston, *Mr. Henley's Letters and Advertisements, Which concern Mr. Whiston* (London, 1727), pp. 14-16.

[78] *Oratory Transactions, No. I,* p. 13.

[79] For an account of the plan of The Oratory, the principles governing its conferences, the procedures followed in them, the first ser-

ligion, and upon the liturgy of the primitive Christian church. As a secular institution, it was declared to be an academy of the sciences and languages to supply the want of a university in London. Thus Henley preached sermons on Sunday; and on week days he conducted public conferences, or had others conduct them, on a variety of subjects.[80] He widely advertised himself as a preacher who applied the proper rules of voice and gesture to the presentation of his sermons; and in describing the educational aims of The Oratory in the first sermon he preached there, he said: "Above all, what shall most strongly engage our attention, shall be the beautiful, and long neglected science of rhetoric and elocution."[81] He attracted so much attention with this concern for elocution that by 1727 the publisher of the first edition of the English version of Le Faucheur decided that a second edition would be a profitable enterprise, and commissioned an unidentified editor to see it through the press and to supply, as its title page declared, "an Introduction relating to the Famous Mr. *Henly's* present Oratory."

That introduction indicates at once the intensity of the public interest in Henley and the controversies that were surrounding his elocutionary techniques. It begins:

> The Town having been of late very much alarm'd at the *Reverend* and *ingenious* Mr. *Henly's* extraordinary Performances and Attempts, to revive the antient Manner of Speaking in Public, upon all Occasions; several Pamphlets have appear'd in the World, and particularly one, written by Mr. *Wood*, which mightily condemns Mr. *Henly's* Gestures, comparing them to the absurd and indecent Gesticulations of a *Merry-Andrew* or *Harlequin*. Mr. *Wood* lashing the *Newport Market* Orator's Gestures so satyrically, and at the same time referring his Readers to the following Sheets, whereby they might judge how different Mr. *Henly's* Gestures were from the Rules laid down in them; great Demands were made for them, which is the real and true Occasion for their appearing abroad once more in public Print. . . .[82]

Having thus justified the republication of the English version of Le Faucheur, the editor goes on to speak of the circumstances under which it was first published in England and composed in France. Then he discusses speaking and action in oratory, and at length returns to the subject of Henley:

> To Conclude. Notwithstanding the great Pains and Industry, of the *Reverend Mr. Henley*, and his under Strapers to collect Passages from Authors upon *Elocution;* Yet it is very much feared he will have but little longer Success,

mon preached there, the text of its liturgy, and so on, see John Henley, *The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity* (London, 1727).

[80] See John Henley, *Oratory Transactions, No. II* (London, n.d.), which contains a list of sermons, theological lectures, and academic lectures delivered at The Oratory from July 3, 1726, to August 31, 1728.

[81] For the text of this sermon, see *The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity*, where it is paged with the "Four Discourses," pp. 25-41. My quotation is from p. 38. In restoring the science of elocution, Henley, on July 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1726, delivered a series of lectures on the following topics: "The general Principles of Speaking"; "The general Principles of Action"; "The Antient History of Action"; "Remarks on some Rules of *Quintilian*." On August 31, he delivered a lecture on "The Action of the Eye and Features." See *Oratory Transactions, No. II*, under "The Academical . . . Subjects of the Oratory."

[82] *The Art of Speaking in Publick*, pp. x-xi. The Wood referred to here elsewhere calls himself William Wood of Christ Church, Oxford. He had offered himself in 1726 as a lecturer in The Oratory, and had been commissioned by Henley to collect for delivery at The Oratory an hour's worth of passages from Cicero on the subject of voice and gesture. But it seems that at this same time Wood was preparing to publish an attack upon Henley. When Henley discovered Wood's duplicity, he accused him of sodomy, and later threatened him with a duel. For details of this strange business, see William Wood, *The Dueling Orator delineated* (London, 1726). It could well be that William Wood is the anonymous editor of *The Art of Speaking in Publick* and took revenge upon Henley by writing unfavorably of him in the introduction of that work.

because his own Gestures are thought by many experienc'd *Orators* not conformable to the Precepts he lays down, and if they were, as they really in Fact are not; yet his Auditors cou'd never attain it, without a diligent and constant Practice.[83]

As for Henley's actual contributions to the doctrine of the elocutionary movement, we have space here only to mention one of his sermons. Indeed, it is his chief publication in this field, and it circulated widely in its time. But we should bear in mind that among the voluminous Henley manuscripts in the British Museum and the Guildhall Library, London, there are other writings on this subject,[84] and that someday they too ought to be discussed, along with all of his scattered pronouncements of the same kind.

On Sunday, November 15, 1724, when he was still the rector of his country benefice, and had not yet broken with the Anglican establishment, Henley preached in the Church of St. George the Martyr, in London, a sermon on his theory of elocution. It was published the following year at the request of many in the audience under the title *The History And Advantages of divine Revelation, with the Honour, that is due to the Word of God; especially in regard to the most Perfect Manner Of delivering it, form'd on the antient Laws of Speaking and Action: Being an Essay to restore them.*[85] It was given a second edition in 1727, appearing as one of the units in Henley's *The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity*;[86] and the same second edition was included as a part of one of Henley's later works, *Oratory Transactions, No. II.*

The sermon is on the text of I Samuel 3.1: "And the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision." Henley lays down three purposes for his discourse, and proceeds to fulfill each. The first is that of commenting upon the several methods God used in the period between the Creation and the writing of the Gospels to reveal his will to mankind. The second is that of showing what honor and happiness came to men as a result of these revelations. And the third, which concerns Henley's theory of elocution, is that of weighing the respect to be paid to God's word in general and particularly in preaching upon it. Thus Henley speaks "of sacred eloquence, or the oratory of the pulpit; with regard to the publick exercise of it."[87] He presupposes, he says, that the preacher is qualified for his task by nature and by training, and that he has "a well weigh'd composition, or, a discourse in the mind, and a ready mastery of it in speaking."[88] What, then, should be the preacher's chief concern in utterance and gesture?

Henley's answer to this question sounds familiar to anyone who has followed Le Faucheur's ideas into their first English version and through their subsequent use by Gildon and the anonymous author of *Some Rules for Speaking and Action.* Indeed, in the second edition of the sermon now under

[83] *The Art of Speaking in Publick,* pp. xxiii-xxiv.

[84] I have not examined the Henley manuscripts in the Guildhall Library, but I have looked at some of those in the British Museum, and have read the following ones, which, although only of minor interest, do bear upon speaking and action in oratory: "Eloquence of the Pulpit"; "The Action of the Eye, and Aspect"; "Action of the Hands"; see Additional Mss. 19,925.

[85] The imprint reads: "*London:* Printed for *T. Longman,* at the *Ship* and *Black-swan* in *Pater-noster-row; J. Mac-Euen,* in the *Strand;* and sold at his shop in *Edenburgh;* and *G. Dommer.* 1725." There is a copy at the Bodleian Library.

[86] My present discussion is based upon the second edition as it is given in that work.

[87] *The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity,* p. 15.

[88] *Ibid.,* p. 15.

consideration, Henley inserts a note which refers to what Bishops Ken, Burnet, Sprat, and Gibson had said in recommending greater attention to delivery on the part of clergymen,[89] and, as we know, Henley could have found in *Some Rules for Speaking and Action* the very passages in question, so far as Bishops Burnet and Sprat are concerned. Moreover, the following passage from Henley's sermon parallels the philosophy of Le Faucheur's *Traitté:*

> In proper speaking and gesture, the nature of the thing spoken, strongly imprinted on the mind, and present feeling of the orator, is the only guidance; and as things are, in their own nature, various, they necessarily require a variation of the voice, and of the deportment, that is conformable to each of them: and the precise fitness of one certain sound and movement of the whole person, even to a line of the countenance, to one certain thing, most properly and perfectly express'd, and the consequent unfitness of any other, to it, are as demonstrable, as any proposition in the Mathematics.[90]

And the same parallelism becomes even more apparent when Henley recommends varying the voice in relation to the parts of the oration and the kinds of passions involved in it. He adds:

> These, and all other subjects, claim a diversity of pronunciation, and of the conduct, agreeable to the distinct and true nature and merits of them. And this should be carefully study'd, in reading the offices of those churches, where prayers are to be read, as well as in the discourses.[91]

There is much else in this sermon to remind us of the part played by the English version of Le Faucheur in focusing attention upon delivery as a separate problem in rhetoric, and upon the extensive classical doctrine connected with that problem. But enough has been said to indicate Henley's debt to Le Faucheur's translator and to suggest that Henley himself contributed to the understanding of what he describes as "the nature of sacred elocution, the rules, the advantages, and history of it, the causes of our defects in it, the proper remedies, and the right treatment of objections to it."[92] But a further elaboration of his contribution is impossible at this time.

7.

In bringing this paper to a conclusion, I feel justified in saying that Henley, Gildon, Curll, and the unknown translator of Le Faucheur, as well as the anonymous author of *Some Rules for Speaking and Action,* should not be allowed henceforth to suffer the neglect that has been their lot since their own generation perished. They have much to teach us about the genesis of the elocutionary movement in England. And they have much to teach us about the merits and the shortcomings of that movement. No subsequent elocutionist in England was more firmly grounded in the classics than Le Faucheur proved himself to be, and no one of them understood better than he the other parts of the whole Ciceronian doctrine of rhetoric. He teaches us that voice and gesture are important in the total problem of oral communication, and he gives us a critical interpretation of the best classical thinking upon these matters. But also he makes us uneasily aware, as he himself was, that voice and gesture seem much more trivial when studied by themselves than they are when studied within the context of the best possible conceptions of invention, arrangement, and style. It was the solidest virtue of Cicero's and Quintilian's rhetorical writings that they saw delivery as an activity allied with, but never separable from, the speaker's

[89] *Ibid.*, p. 19. A different note appears at this point in the first edition.
[90] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[91] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

need to know his subject, to arrange it properly, and to give it effective expression. Indeed, Cicero and Quintilian had learned this virtue from Aristotle, and the lesson should never be forgotten, even if we can safely forget some of the means provided by the ancients for guaranteeing knowledge of subject matter and for defining adequate standards of organization and style in discourse. Despite his other virtues, however, Le Faucheur forgot this lesson or saw it only as a pious formulation to which he must subscribe while he proceeded to do what the formulation forbade. Thus he and the other authors with whom I have here been occupied sought to save classical rhetoric by rediscovering its precepts of delivery and by emphasizing them by themselves, whereas in reality classical rhetoric could best have been saved by modernizing those precepts and by teaching them only within the context of philosophically reconstituted theories of invention, arrangement, and style.

* * *

RHETORIC AND THE LITERATURE OF THE ENGLISH MIDDLE AGES

Donald Lemen Clark

MEDIEVALISTS are habituated to meeting the most abstract and abstruse concepts under the guise of allegory. They will have no difficulty in recognizing that allegories of rhetoric may be, not only picturesque, but accurate representations of what the Middle Ages conceived rhetoric to be. Hence the opening of this discussion, in an effort to teach delightfully, will present some allegories of Lady Rhetoric. The unadorned exposition of doctrine will follow.

The allegory of Lady Rhetoric owes its popularity to the fifth century treatise of Martianus Capella, whose *Marriage of Philology and Mercury* combines a compend of the Seven Liberal Arts with allegorical descriptions of the Seven Learned Ladies. Martianus describes Rhetorica as "a woman of loftiest stature and great assurance, with countenance of radiant splendor. . . . Helmeted and crowned with royal majesty, she held ready for defense or for attack weapons that gleamed with the flash of lightning. Beneath her armor, her vesture glittered with the various light of all *figurae*, all *schemata*; and she was cinctured with most precious *colores* for jewels."[1]

Mr. Clark (Ph.D., Columbia, 1920) is Emeritus Professor of Rhetoric in Columbia University. He has published many studies in rhetoric and literature, including Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance *(1922),* Milton at St. Paul's School *(1948), and most recently* Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education *(1957).* *The present paper in its first form was read at the Third Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English, held at Jesus College, Cambridge, 22 August 1956.*

A thousand years later Rhetorica is recognizable as the same lady in a woodcut from the medieval encyclopaedia *Margarita Philosophica* (1503).[2] But she reflects an even more accurate and full statement of traditional Greco-Roman rhetoric. By the sword and the lily which extend from her mouth she represents allegorically the two traditional functions of rhetoric: to attack and defend by verbal arguments and to embellish speech with verbal adornment. The beauty of her gown and the ringlets of her coiffure represent beauty of style. The words embroidered on the hem of her robe designate the *colores* or figures of speech, and the enthymemes and *exempla,* types of deductive and inductive argument. Her gown is embraced by the Zone of Justice.

In the picture Rhetorica is surrounded by human figures identified by name. At the top Aristotle represents natural philosophy; Justinian, the use of rhetoric in support of law; Seneca, moral philosophy; Sallust, history. Less to be expected is Virgil, crowned with laurel and holding in extended hands a book marked *Poesis.* His presence on the lily side of Lady Rhetoric symbolizes the influence of the embellished style of rhetoric on the style of poetry. In the foreground Cicero is clearly shown defending Milo in a court of law, and the Senatus Populusque Romanus figures forth the scene of deliberative rhetoric.

[1] Martianus Capella, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii et de septem artibus liberalibus libri novem,* ed. Adolph Dick (Leipzig, 1925). The description of Rhetorica, as translated, is from C. S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York, 1928), pp. 93-94.

[2] G. Reisch, *Margarita Philosophica* (Freiburg, 1503; Strasburg, 1504).

The combative aspect of rhetoric as a verbal weapon for attack or defense is emphasized in a sculptured relief of Lady Rhetoric on the campanile at Florence. She is armed with sword and shield, but is unadorned by the embellishments furnished by the hairdresser or dressmaker. In her functional plainness she is an unusual allegory. In most medieval allegories Lady Rhetoric is shown to represent little but embellishment of style. Characteristic is the *Court of Sapyence,* formerly attributed to Lydgate, and *The Pastime of Pleasure* by Stephen Hawes.[3]

I had hoped that the allegory would help me to fulfill the first duty which rhetoric imposes on a speaker: the duty of defining his terms. This I believe the allegory does, whether we accept the habitual Roman definition of rhetoric as the *ars bene dicendi,* the art of effective public speech, or the more philosophical Aristotelian definition, the art of discovering all available means to persuasion in any subject.

The picture also helps me to fulfill the second duty of a rhetorician—that of analysis. One mode of analysis depends on what the speaker wants to accomplish in a given speech situation. He may have to deal with a situation growing out of a trial in court, a debate in a deliberative assembly, an occasion to be adorned. In a trial he practises what is variously termed forensic or judicial rhetoric. He endeavors to prove that Milo should be acquitted of a charge of murder. He is debating the justice or injustice of a past action. In the realm of imaginative literature, the owl and the nightingale debate the good or bad effects of their past actions and present influence. The body and the soul debate the question, Who was to blame for the disaster they both find themselves in after death? The speakers are presented as well trained in forensic rhetoric.

If the speaker urges someone to do or not do something, he is practising deliberative rhetoric and will endeavor to show that the line of conduct recommended for the future is or is not possible, honorable, and expedient. Naturally enough, perhaps, one of the oldest themes for deliberation in the ancient schools of rhetoric was: Should a man marry? Chaucer, in *The Merchant's Tale,* shows his familiarity when he gives an account of the deliberations of January, Justinus, and Placebo. It is just to marry, possible, expedient as bringing many comforts; it is fitting as showing a disposition not savage. A great deal of the imaginative literature of the Middle Ages, as of all periods, is concerned with urging a course of action. The lady should love the poet. The reader should love Truth. Rhetoric is at hand to help.

If, however, the speaker is adorning an occasion, such as a funeral, the visit of an ambassador, or a saint's day, he will lavish encomium on the person whom he celebrates. Or he may vituperate an evil person, such as a political opponent or heretic. He will be practising what Aristotle called epideictic and the Romans demonstrative rhetoric. The whole corpus of anti-feministic literature in the Middle Ages utilized the traditional topics of rhetorical vituperation. Likewise the literature of praise, saints' lives, hymns, panegyrics of princes utilized the topics of encomium. St. Basil alone warned that only true virtues were to be praised in lives of saints and

[3] H. N. MacCracken, ed., *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate,* Early English Text Society, extra series, CVII [London & N. Y., 1911 (for 1910)]. Stephen Hawes, *The Pastime of Pleasure,* ed. W. E. Mead, E.E.T.S., CXVI [Oxford, 1928 (for 1927)]. I discuss rhetoric as aureate language in *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (New York, 1922), pp. 47-55.

martyrs. He well knew that in secular panegyric all good things were rhetorically attributed to the hero whether he possessed them or not.[4]

Thus far I have dealt with the first of the arts a speaker must learn to use in all speech situations—*inventio*, rhetorical invention, the art of exploring the issues to discover what arguments can be used for or against the probability of a proposition. Modern critics sometimes deplore that the Middle Ages did not have Aristotle's *Rhetorica*, Cicero's complete *De oratore*, more of Quintilian. But they did have Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, attributed to Cicero until the fifteenth century. When a medieval writer speaks of Tully in rhetorical contexts, he is speaking of these works. They are not so philosophical as Aristotle, nor so charming as *De oratore*, but no more practical guides to rhetorical precept could be wished for. Medieval speakers and writers did have access to many manuscripts of these works (over 100 of *Ad Herennium* survive)[5] and made good use of them.

The second art the speaker or writer could learn from rhetoric is the art of arranging or disposing his matter in such a sequence as to lead his audience to understand and believe. In part this art of *dispositio* dealt with the parts of a speech. First is an *exordium* which aims to make the hearer attentive, friendly, and docile. This is followed by a *narratio*, a statement of facts colored in the speaker's favor. The body of the speech is the *confirmatio* and *refutatio*, the marshalling of arguments in support and in rebuttal. Finally the *peroratio*, which recapitulates and drives home.

When the official business of secular and ecclesiastical princes, and especially of the papal curia, made written communication more useful and frequent than oral, the art of the oration was easily adapted to the art of the formal Latin epistle or *dictamen*. Thus in his *Flores Rhetorici* of the eleventh century Alberico of Montecassino is thinking of *dictamen* when he says, "The writer will design his proem to render the mind of the reader attentive, friendly, and docile."[6] The epistle, to be sure, also has a salutation which Alberico hopes will be adapted to the person addressed, to the circumstances, and to the writer's intention. The Latin epistle, of course, had been a literary form in antiquity as it continued to be in the Renaissance. John of Salisbury was only one of the accomplished letter writers of the Middle Ages. I am claiming as literature, of course, quite a variety of literary kinds, prose compositions as well as poems, Latin as well as vernacular, which benefited from the inherited precepts of ancient *inventio* and *dispositio*. Medieval rhetoric was a respectable intellectual discipline. Romantic critics can and do deplore the tendency of this rhetoric to encourage an argumentative and disputatious tendency in imaginative literature. Scholastic logic encouraged the same tendency. Both encouraged a temper of didacticism. The Middle Ages believed that poetry as well as philosophy was founded on *doctrina*.

But students of medieval literature have not forgotten Virgil with his book of poetry on the lily side of Lady Rhetoric in the allegorical woodcut. These students might believe that Virgil has

[4] *In Gordium*, 142D-143A. Quoted in J. M. Campbell, *The Influence of the second sophistic on the style of the sermons of St. Basil the Great* (Washington, D. C., 1922), p. 147.

[5] *Ad C. Herennium: de ratione dicendi* with an English translation by Harry Caplan, The Loeb Classical Library (Harvard Univ. Press, 1954), p. xxxv. This annotated edition will be a great help to students of medieval rhetoric.

[6] Alberici Casinensis, *Flores Rhetorici*, ed. D. M. Inguanez and H. M. Willard (Montecassino, 1938). *Prologus*, II, 1.

wandered into this allegory from another allegory which should be devoted to poetry. But in the scheme of the Seven Liberal Arts in ancient and medieval education there was no separate place for poetry, whether interpreted narrowly as verse or in the broadest Aristotelian terms as fiction, either narrative or dramatic. St. Thomas Aquinas and Roger Bacon made poetry a part of logic. This makes sense if we take logic, as John of Salisbury did, to be the art of the *logos,* the word, all verbal communication.[7] In ancient and medieval schools of grammar poetry was taught as a sanction for linguistic purity and for stylistic appropriateness and beauty. This is illustrated by Priscian whose precepts of grammar are exemplified by excerpts from the best Latin literature. Grammar-school boys also wrote verses to help them understand the metrics of ancient poetry. That poetry is closely related to rhetoric is pointed out by Aristotle. Both are closest in their literary style as distinguished from their matter. The school of the orator Gorgias, he said, learned stylistic embellishment from the poets. Later literary history shows that the poets, in turn, learned stylistic embellishment from rhetoric. From the rhetoricated prose of the second sophistic and from the sophisticated verse of Ovid, throughout the Middle Ages to mid-seventeenth century, poets devoted what to modern taste was an excessive attention to embellishment of style. The principal sources of embellishment were such tropes as metaphor, irony, and insinuation; such verbal patterns, *schemata,* as alliteration, assonance, antithesis, balance, and parallelism. These and many more departures from plain statement we lump together as figures of speech.[8]

In antiquity and in the Middle Ages they were frequently referred to metaphorically as *colores* in the picture of Lady Rhetoric or as *flores* as in the *Flores Rhetorici* of Alberico. Some puritans in antiquity and later considered them flowers of evil, but most people loved them. They occupy as much as half of the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium.* When I was studying the medieval contributions to the vogue of aureate language in my *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (1922), the most portentous work I had access to was the *Poetria* of John of Garlandia.[9] This work, a combination of *Ars Dictaminis* and a treatise on style, was characterized by the same preoccupation with beauteous language that I found in *The Castle of Sapyence,* then ascribed to Lydgate, and in Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure.* But since Faral's valued editions with commentaries of the Arts Poétiques of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (1923),[10] medieval rhetoric has almost become synonymous with the arts of stylistic embellishment which the authors of the treatises, especially Geoffrey of Vinsauf, Matthieu of Vendôme, and Evrard l'Allemand, had learned from *Ad Herennium,* as Faral has pointed out in detail. Since his publication of the sources there has been a whole school of critical books and articles on Chaucer's rhetoric, which have made good use of his collection, beginning with Manly, *Chaucer and the Rhetoricians* (1926).[11] The dis-

[7] *Metalogicon,* I, 10.

[8] D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York, 1957), pp. 25-26; 83-107.

[9] *Poetria magister Johannis anglici de arte prosayca metrica et rithmica,* ed. G. Mari, *Romanische Forschungen* (1902), XIII, 883 ff.

[10] Edmond Faral, *Les Arts Poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe Siècles* (Paris, 1923).

[11] J. M. Manly, "Chaucer and the Rhetoricians," *Wharton Lecture on English Poetry,* XVII (1926); C. S. Baldwin, "Cicero on Parnassus," *PMLA,* XLII (March 1927), 106-12; Traugott Maunin, *Der Einfluss der mittelalterlichen Rhetorik auf Chaucer's Dichtung* (Bonn diss. 1929); Marie P. Hamilton, "Notes on Chaucer and the Rhetoricians," *PMLA,* XLVII (June 1932), 403-09; Florence E. Teager, "Chaucer's

cussion of medieval rhetoric as beauteous language has continued and gives a very full treatment of what Virgil in the woodcut had learned about the flowers of rhetoric. I need not recapitulate the well-known story, but I must add that most medieval poets probably learned more about the embellished style from *Ad Herennium* and other school books than from their later reading of the poets writing poetry about poetry. Geoffrey of Vinsauf belongs on the library shelf with Horace, Vida, and Boileau, not in the school room.

What has received less attention than it deserves is the influence on poets of their grammar school training in boyhood. To this problem I shall now turn—still using allegory when possible. Let me describe Lady Grammar as she appears in another woodcut from the *Margarita Philosophica*. She stands before the Tower of Knowledge with a child standing at her feet. In one hand she holds a hornbook which shows the letters of the alphabet. In her other hand she holds the key to unlock the door of the narrow gate to the Tower. She is not so pretty as Lady Rhetoric, nor so elaborately dressed. But she seems kind. Much kinder than Lady Grammar carved on the portico of Chartres Cathedral, with a switch in her hand threatening a child who cowers at her knee. In the woodcut the ground floor of the Tower is occupied by a schoolmaster labeled Donatus, who had been teaching elementary grammar to boys from the time of St. Jerome. On the floor above sits Priscian, prepared to teach more advanced grammar. Of him more anon. On the next floor above sits Tully (Cicero) whose labels indicate that he teaches both rhetoric and poetry. He is the Tully who was assumed to have written *Ad Herennium* as well as *De inventione*. His joint function here is quite as significant as the presence of Virgil at the knee of Lady Rhetoric in the other allegory. Rhetoric taught the poets.

As I have already said, the ancient grammar school and such teachers as Priscian taught a great deal of literature as well as what we think of as grammar. So in his thirteenth-century allegorical poem, *The Battle of the Seven Arts*, Henri d'Andeli shows Lady Grammar leading the cohorts of the Latin authors, as models for imitation, against the *Artes*, or textbooks, devoted to teaching the precepts of the arts. Priscian fights in her army.[12] But teachers of grammar also taught elementary exercises in rhetoric. My thesis is that the practises of the ancient grammar schools in this respect continued in medieval schools, although the stream was undoubtedly reduced to a trickle between Ausonius and Alcuin. In the north the stream may well have dried up for a while. But certainly the very best traditions were flourishing in the school of Chartres as described by John of Salisbury in the *Metalogicon*.[13] I have not enough evidence to prove that elementary exercises in rhetoric were taught much earlier than the twelfth century, but I wish to present at least some arguments in support of my conjecture. One of these arguments is derived from the works of Priscian of Caesarea, a schoolmaster in Constantinople, who, in the early sixth century wrote a most complete grammar of the Latin language, to help Greeks, it seems, to learn the

Eagle and the Rhetorical Colors," *PMLA*, XLVII (June 1932), 410-18; Benjamin S. Harrison, "Medieval Rhetoric in the *Book of the Duchesse*," *PMLA*, XLIX (June 1934), 428-42; Helge Kökeritz, "Rhetorical Word-Play in Chaucer," *PMLA*, LXIX (September 1954), 937.

[12] Henri d'Andeli, *La Bataille des VII Ars*, edited and translated with introduction and notes by L. J. Paetow (Berkeley, 1914).

[13] *Metalogicon*, ed. and trans. by D. D. McGarry (Berkeley, 1955), I, 17-24.

language of the West. Consequently this grammar became an invaluable aid in teaching Latin to the assorted tribes of barbarians who had destroyed western civilization and were in process of becoming Christianized and civilized. They had to learn Latin if they were to become priests who could read the Scriptures and participate in the liturgy. The responsibility for teaching passed early from the monasteries to the cathedral grammar schools. Lecturers on Priscian were, as Richard Hunt has shown, preparing young men to teach young men to teach boys in *parvis scholis,* which prepared for the grammar schools.[14] Priscian's own works show what the master of a grammar school was expected to teach. In addition to his *Institutionum grammaticarum libri xviii* Priscian wrote on Roman numerals, a treatise on the meters of Terence, and an explication of the text of 12 lines of Virgil, as a model, perhaps, for the new critics.[15] Most important for my argument, he published a close translation of the elementary exercises in rhetoric, or *progymnasmata,* attributed to Hermogenes, a second-century schoolmaster of Tarsus.[16] Priscian's version was, I believe, accessible to most medieval schools in England. Aldhelm, who died in 709, is the first to note Priscian's arrival in Britain.[17] It seems more than probable that Theodore of Tarsus, when he went to England as Archbishop in 667, had the elementary exercises in rhetoric in his baggage, not only Priscian's Latin version, but the Greek of Hermogenes of Tarsus as well, which probably had contributed to making his own school days miserable. In England he and Abbot Hadrian instructed their scholars in Latin and Greek.

Hertz states that in the neighborhood of 1000 manuscripts survive.[18] In their present condition some of these do not include the elementary exercises in rhetoric, which traditionally appear as the final treatise in Priscian's *Opera.* Worn out with use, perhaps. The oldest manuscript is Paris 7530, written in the eighth century.[19] It includes the rhetorical exercises as do all thirteen printings of Priscian from 1470 to 1500.

By 1542 Priscian's Hermogenes was superseded as a manual for speaking and writing themes by Latin translations of Aphthonius, who was teaching in Antioch in the fourth century. His precepts are almost identical with those of Priscian's Hermogenes, but he won the textbook market in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because he included model themes.[20] A very good idea of what the elementary exercises taught can be gained by Baldwin's translation from Hermogenes[21] and from Nadeau's translation of Aphthonius.[22] Priscian's

[14] Richard Hunt, "Studies in Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies,* I (1943) and II (1950).

[15] Priscian, *Opera,* ed. by Martin Hertz in Vol. III of H. Keil, *Grammatici latini* (Leipzig, 1870-1880). Keil himself edited the *Praeexercitamina.*

[16] *Praeexercitamina Prisciani grammatici ex Hermogene versa,* in K. Halm, *Rhetores latini minores* (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 551-560. In his *Praef.,* xiii-xiv, he says his text is better than Keil's. The best modern treatment of Priscian is R. Helm's article *Priscianus,* in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (Neue Bearbeitung),* XXII (1954), 2327-2346.

[17] Aldhelm used a good bit of Priscian in his own treatise on grammar and metrics. Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (München, 1911), I, 137. For Aldhelm's and Theodore's contribution to the Medieval grammar schools see A. F. Leach, *The Schools of Medieval England* (New York, 1915), pp. 31-45.

[18] Martin Hertz, *Gram. Lat.* III, *Praef.* ix. Hilda Buttenwieser considers Hertz's estimate an exaggeration. She counts about 370 MSS which were transcribed before the Fourteenth Century. "Popular Authors of the Middle Ages," *Speculum,* XVII (January 1942), p. 53.

[19] *Praef.* to Priscian's minor works.

[20] D. L. Clark, "The Rise and Fall of Progymnasmata in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammar Schools," *SM,* XIX (November 1952), 259.

[21] *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic,* pp. 23-38.

[22] R. Nadeau, "The Progymnasmata of Aphthonius in Translation," *SM,* XIX (November 1952), 265 ff.

Latin version differs somewhat from Hermogenes in that he introduces examples from Roman writers not mentioned in the Greek.

Priscian's own view of the value of the elementary exercises in rhetoric is contained in his dedicatory epistle to Symmachus, who was consul in 485 and was in Constantinople some time during his consulship. The exercises, he writes, give youths practice in all kinds of rhetoric, "nec non etiam de praeexercitamentis rhetoricis, quae Graeci progymnasmata vocant, quoniam diligentius ea sophistae iuniores, quos sequimur, aptioribus divisionibus ad exercendas iuvenes ad omne rhetoricae genus exposuisse creduntur."[23] All our manuscripts are descended from a transcript by Priscian's pupil the calligrapher Theodorus, made in 526-527. Keil, who edited the text, says the oldest and best MS is Paris 7530, written in the eighth century. In this MS the elementary exercises in rhetoric open, "Incip. praeexercitamina prisciani grammatici de fabula."[24]

But let me briefly describe the exercises as they were available to English schoolboys from the late seventh century in Priscian. As the *incipit* states the first exercise is *fabula*.

Praeexercitamina Prisciani

1. FABULA was a retelling of fictitious stories by the younger boys—stories they were familiar with from their reading of the poets. These paraphrases might be either expanded or condensed.

2. NARRATIO was slightly more advanced. The boys might retell historical as well as legendary and fictitious stories, based on their reading. *Ad Herennium* recommends both of these as elementary exercises.[25] Chaucer was only one medieval poet given to retelling, shortening, or expanding old tales.

3. USUS is the name Priscian gives to the exercise known to the Greeks as *chreia*. It drills the boys in a set pattern for dilating on such a theme as "Isocrates said that the root of education is bitter but its fruit is sweet." The pattern was: first praise the sayer, then paraphrase the saying, cite a contrast, give an illustration, cite an example, quote an authority, urge the hearer to follow what was said. *Ad Herennium*, the earliest surviving textbook to describe the exercise, called it *expolitio*.[26] As *expolitio* it was explained among the figures of amplification by Geoffrey of Vinsauf.[27] As *expolitio* or as *usus* the exercise encouraged many medieval poets to stop their story in order to expatiate, amplify, dilate, pile it on, and inflate.

4. SENTENTIA, or proverb, was essentially more practice in dilating on a theme and taught the use of the same topics. The pattern was: praise the author of the proverb, paraphrase the proverb, give a reason, cite a contrast, make a comparison, give an example, quote an authority, end with a hortatory conclusion.[28]

5. REFUTATIO, as the exercise was developed, included *confirmatio*. The boys were taught to subject such legends as that of Arion and the dolphin to destructive analysis by alleging that the legend is obscure, incredible, impossible, inconsistent, unfitting, inexpedient. The stories were drawn from the poets the boys were reading. Unlike medieval

[23] *Gram. Lat.* III, 405, 1
[24] Keil, *Praef.* to Priscian's minor works.
[25] I, 12-13.
[26] IV, 54-58.
[27] *Poetria Nova*, 11.1245-1251. Faral, 235.
[28] Priscian on *Sententia* was taken over by Lorich in his expanded Latin Aphthonius (1546) and served as a model for Milton's *Prolusion on Early Rising*. D. L. Clark, *John Milton at St. Paul's School* (New York, 1948), pp. 234-237.

schoolboys ancient schoolboys were not taught to accept the legends when interpreted allegorically.

6. LOCUS COMMUNIS, as an exercise, is not the same as the use of the word *commonplace* to describe *loci* or places where arguments may be discovered. It is called commonplace, says Priscian, because it deals with the common or general, not the individual. As an exercise it is an amplification of a thing admitted. It does not investigate whether anyone has robbed a temple, for instance. That is admitted. But it enlarges on the viciousness of all temple robbers. The theme is to follow this pattern: analyze the contrary, describe the deed itself, quote a proverb, make a comparison, make a defamatory surmise of the past life of the criminal, repudiate pity by drawing on the final topics of equity, justice, expediency, possibility, and propriety, and by description of the crime. Chaucer's Pardoner or his sources, the Parson or any preacher, is adept in using commonplaces against any or all of the seven deadly sins and the sinners who practice them. The exercise of *locus communis* is planned to make them adept.

7. LAUS, including its opposite, vituperation, is familiar to us as encomium or panegyric. I have already mentioned praise and dispraise as functions of demonstrative or epideictic rhetoric. Priscian is exceedingly full. He teaches how to praise men, cities, animals, virtues. If you praise a man you praise his race, city, and family; his education; the nature of his soul and body; his achievements in war and peace; the manner of his end; his children. Then draw comparisons. Each of these heads has, of course, subheads. *Ad Herennium* follows closely the topics of the elementary exercise, but properly deals with praise and dispraise as something to use in mature rhetoric dealing with actual cases, usually as part of the *narratio* of a speech.[29]

8. COMPARATIO, Priscian points out, has already been included under *commonplace* and *laus*. But other writers include it as a separate exercise, so he includes it. Sometimes one compares two men, praising one and dispraising the other, or praising both in differing degrees.

9. ALLOCUTIO is the name Priscian gives to an exercise that the Greeks called *prosopopoeia* and we might call impersonation. *Ad Herennium* calls it *conformatio* as do the *Arts Poétiques*.[30] The students are set to compose speeches appropriate to real or imagined characters under given situations: What words Andromache might speak to Hector. Priscian calls the exercise *conformatio* when we invent a speaker who was not there as well as words for him to speak, as Cicero has the Republic speak an invective against Catiline. Let the diction be appropriate to the person supposed to be speaking.

The characters and situations were drawn from literature the boys were reading. And as Quintilian remarked, the exercise would be especially useful for a boy who, when he grew up, would be a poet or historian.[31] The effect of the exercise would be to make the speech appropriate to the speaker and the situation, but it would encourage the poet to write set speeches rather than dialog in imitation of conversation.

10. DESCRIPTIO is an exercise in "bringing before one's eyes what is to be shown." The description, or ecphrasis, may be of people, actions, times, places, seasons, alone or in combination. Priscian illustrates with a line and a half

[29] III, 13-15.
[30] Faral, p. 54.
[31] III, viii, 49.

from Virgil. As the exercise was unrelated to a context, it encouraged the composition of detached set pieces of decoration, frequently on a stock subject, which could be and were inserted in longer works. Chaucer's long description of Lady Blanche is characteristic, and closely parallels Geoffrey of Vinsauf's model description of a beautiful woman in *Poetria Nova*.[32] But the bad habit of the set description, or "purple patch," was much older than Horace's ridicule of it.

11. POSITIO is Priscian's word for what the ancients and the moderns call *thesis*. The thesis was the first exercise to require the boys to argue both sides of a matter still in doubt. It occupies the field of general debate, not referring to any particular person. The *positio* or *thesis* debates, Should a man marry? not, Should a particular man marry? The topics are justice, expediency, possibility, propriety. Thus: It is just to marry and make the contribution to life of life itself; it is expedient as bringing many comforts; it is possible; it is fitting as showing a disposition not savage. I have already pointed out Chaucer's use of these arguments.

12. LEGISLATIO is an exercise in speaking for or against a law, not a real law in an actual situation but a fancied or perhaps an archaic law not associated with any attendant circumstances. The example is, Should governmental positions be put on sale? Arguments are drawn from the following places: Is it manifest, just, legal, expedient, possible, proper? Priscian's Hermogenes includes the exercise because others do, although it really constitutes a separate study.

Priscian's elementary exercises were the only ones available to the Latin West until the sixteenth century. But other textbook writers appropriated the exercises of Priscian and helped to give them added currency. As Engelhardt points out, "Priscian uses the very terms which Geoffrey of Vinsauf later applied to dilation and abbreviation: *latius, breviter, producere*."[33]

The first two exercises, *fabula* and *narratio*, taught how to condense and abbreviate a story through paraphrase. The paraphrase at times might be longer than the original, but the emphasis was on brevity demanded by all rhetoricians in the *narratio* of a speech. All the other exercises taught the art of expatiating on a theme by the use of the *loci* or *topoi*, the places of argument, including definition, genus and species, cause and effect, contrast, similarity, consistency, conjunction, repugnancy, time (present, past, and future), magnitude (greater or less), paraphrase, example, and testimony of authorities. It was the art of exaggerating, piling up, dilating, expanding, iterating. It sought the *copia verborum* and the *copia rerum* which Erasmus learned from the rhetoric of the Middle Ages and taught to the sixteenth century. When applied to narrative, prose or poetry, this art seeking amplitude envelops the narrative in superabundance.[34]

Whether Chaucer learned this rhetorical art from Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Ad Herennium*, or Priscian, or carried it over from his sources, he does, as Manly demonstrated, follow the formulas for amplification by means of description, digression, piling up examples, prosopopoeia, paraphrase, and circumlocution. For abbreviation he uses asyndeton and condensed versions of *fabula*, and his favorite, *occultatio* (paralipsis), the refusal to describe or narrate. He does,

[32] Chaucer, *Blanche*, 11.816-1040. Geoffrey, 11.563-597.

[33] George John Engelhardt, "Mediaeval Vestiges in the Rhetoric of Erasmus," PMLA, LXII (June 1948), 739 ff.

[34] *Op. cit.*

to be sure, use these artificial devices for abbreviation or elaboration in the high style, appropriate to the Monk, not in the low style of the Miller.

Kemp Malone has pointed out that "our study of the art of the Beowulf poet needs to take into account the parallelism of parts and other structural features."[35] G. J. Engelhardt considers these and other rhetorical features in his article, "Beowulf: a Study in Dilation." He suggests that the Beowulf poet may well have been introduced to the rhetorical devices of amplification and dilation through the Latin version of the *progymnasmata,* as Priscian was available. He then points out that the structure and development of Beowulf proceed topically, not narratively, by: contrast, cause and effect, opposites, comparison, differences, similarities, and adjuncts. In describing persons the poet uses the *loci* taught by the elementary exercise of *laus:* race, city, family, education, nature of his soul and body, achievements in war and peace, manner of his end, his children. Moreover the events in Beowulf are not given in time order, but are woven forward and backward.[36]

So I conclude with the suggestion that all boys who grew up to be writers went to school to learn to read and write, and that they were drilled in rhetoric, not only by *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium,* but by the elementary exercises of Priscian. Rhetoric was not the only influence on Medieval literature in England, but it was one of them. Rhetoric did teach the poets, as well as the prose writers, to find arguments and to use an embellished and copious style, as the allegories attest.

[35] "Coming Back from the Mere," PMLA, LXIX (December 1954), 1292.

[36] PMLA, LXX (September, 1955), 825.

* * *

THE BRITISH ORATORS, VI
LORD NORTH'S POSTURE OF DEFENSE

Charles Daniel Smith

FREDERICK NORTH (1732-92) was the eldest son of Francis North, First Earl of Guilford, and Lucy Montagu North, daughter of the First Earl of Halifax. Frederick, Prince of Wales, was the child's godfather, and since young North and the Prince's children were playmates, the future George III and his Prime Minister were lifelong acquaintances. Despite his Court connections, North was reared in a devout atmosphere. From childhood, he was surrounded by precepts and examples of the homely virtues which characterized his own life throughout, and in an age when licentiousness was taken for granted, his conduct never gave cause for scandal.

He distinguished himself at Eton and went on to Oxford where he matriculated in Trinity College, founded by his ancestor Sir Thomas Pope. Following his graduation, he made the continental tour, studying international law for one year at the University of Leipzig. On his return to England in 1754, he was elected Member of Parliament for the borough of Banbury. His maiden speech in December 1757 was so well received that he thought he merited a seat on the Board of Trade, of which his uncle the Second Earl of Halifax was President. However, he did not get into an office until 1759 when the Prime Minister, his cousin the Duke of Newcastle, appointed him a junior Lord of the Treasury.

In the Treasury he steadily rose in rank until his name appeared in 1763 immediately below that of George Grenville, First Lord and Chancellor of the Exchequer. When the Grenville ministry fell in 1765, Lord North[1] went into Opposition to the Rockinghams, though they made him several offers to join them. He became Joint-Paymaster in the subsequent Chatham ministry and made such a reputation for financial acumen during the debates in the session of 1766-67 that he was considered the inevitable successor of Charles Townshend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. When Townshend died in the late summer of 1767, however, North had to be bludgeoned into accepting the seals because he had no wish to take a responsible part in a ministry which Chatham himself had deserted and which he thought almost certain to fall. Then too, he feared he might not be able to withstand the onslaughts of a most capable phalanx of Opposition speakers: Isaac Barré, William Beckford, Edmund Burke, William Dowdeswell, George Grenville, Sir William Meredith, Sir George Savile, and many others of proven ability. To make matters worse, General H. S. Conway, Leader of the House, gradually removed himself from that

Mr. Smith (Ph.D., Washington University, 1954), Assistant Professor in Public Address at Syracuse University, is undertaking to collect and edit the letters of Lord North.

[1] Although he did not have a title in his own right until 1790, when he became the Second Earl of Guilford, he was known in the House of Commons as Lord North, his courtesy title as the eldest son of a peer.

function and North was forced to assume it.

With relatively little assistance in debate from other members of the Administration forces, North had to face attack on a number of issues which Opposition ably and thoroughly exploited: the Wilkes case, the threatened war with France, the debts of the king's Civil List, disorders in America, and alleged subversion of the constitution. Although the Bedford party had been induced to join the King's Friends in support of the Grafton ministry in the autumn of 1767 and their combined votes gave North a comfortable initial margin over the various parties in Opposition, he could not count on large automatic majorities, and occasionally Opposition could beat him, as they did, for instance, on the Nullum Tempus Bill.

The traditional explanation for North's success in maintaining the support of the House of Commons on most issues has been that his most effective persuasion was in the form of governmental influence at the polls, the growing number of placemen sitting in the House, and his granting of contracts, titles, and pensions to members in return for favors received. However, this explanation has been challenged by some historians, notably by Sir Lewis Namier, during the past several decades, and the fact is that no ministry, no matter how well supported it might be at the outset, could hope to continue without effective leadership on the floor of the House. This essay has to do with North's leadership as a factor in maintaining the stability of government, and especially with the manner in which he set up his defense against the forces arrayed against him.

Nathaniel Wraxall, who entered the House in 1780, just two years before the end of the North ministry, states that North was "powerful, able, and fluent in debate, sometimes repelling the charges made against him with solid argument, but still more frequently eluding or blunting the weapons of his antagonists by the force of wit."[2] This posture of defense which North adopted on the floor of the House when he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1767, remained his forte during his tenure as Prime Minister (1770-82) because it was well calculated to further his purpose of maintaining a stable government. Since 1760, when George III had come to the throne, one administration had succeeded another in rapid succession, each embarking on new projects and failing to hold any consistent line on old ones. And so when North came to power, his main purpose (one might say his sole purpose) was to defend the *status quo*. His main defensive tactics consisted of evading debate altogether whenever he could, shifting from the precise point at issue, turning the tables on his opponents, but on occasion meeting them with solid argument.

As Leader of the House he was in a position to avoid some troublesome questions by preventing their ever reaching the floor. In May 1768 he learned that Opposition intended to present a petition which would call for free importation of food in order to relieve the poor. He could not afford to offend the agricultural interests by permitting this threat to their protective tariff, and at the same time he did not want to oppose some of his fellow ministers who thought that such a measure ought to be passed, if only to satisfy the hungry people that every possible step was being taken in their behalf. North set up

[2] *Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Sir Nathaniel William Wraxall 1772-84*, ed. Henry Benjamin Wheatley (London, 1884), I, 364.

a plan well organized in depth: 1) try to prevent the petition's being presented; failing that, 2) try to table it; failing that, 3) get it referred to a committee. But then he thought of a simpler plan. On the morning of June 2, he went to the king and "received his commands for adjourning Parliament to the 21st instant, *which His Majesty very much approved* [italics mine]."[3] On the "21st instant" Parliament was prorogued for the summer, and thus North prevented any possibility of debate until the following winter, after another harvest had been gathered.

He also took advantage of his position as a minister to deny members of Opposition access to state papers, in which they hoped to find evidence to back up their charges. They usually tried to obtain all the papers respecting any transaction, and he usually countered that: 1) preparing them would take too long, 2) the request was unprecedented, and 3) members of the House could not possibly read them all. Sometimes he pretended to be willing to show specific papers providing his opponents could tell him exactly what they wanted to see, but more often he worked both sides of the street by charging them with indiscretion for asking to look at state papers and then reminding them later that they had no basis for charges of mismanagement, before they had seen the papers. It was no small advantage to North that he was in a position to control access to the documentary evidence.

Another of his evasive tactics based primarily on maneuver rather than argument consisted of amending an opponent's motion to such an extent that it became unacceptable, not only to the majority of the House but sometimes even to the mover. Thus on January 23, 1769, North succeeded in so radically amending a motion that "Mr. Martin, and those who [had] supported his motion desired to drop it," but Administration "finding the strength of the ground they were got on, would not suffer it."[4] After the vote was taken, Martin moved that his original motion and North's amendments to it be entered separately in the *Journal of the House of Commons* so that "it might not be supposed, out of doors, that he had made the motion as it stood altered by the House,"[5] but the Administration forces also defeated this attempt. All in all, it was a bad day for Martin. He lost his motion and had the amended motion tied around his neck. And never in the process had North allowed the House to debate the merits of the question which Martin had proposed.

Lord North's habit of amending the sense out of motions made by members of Opposition was so much his trademark that when he did not try to do so, they started looking for the joker. When on February 28, 1769, he asked the House to pay more than £500,000 of the king's private debts, Opposition immediately moved for a detailed account of the money George III had spent since his accession. They must have been astonished when Lord North agreed to produce it and even volunteered the account for the last eight years of the reign of George II. Beckford, the Opposition member who spoke next, knew that there was something amiss in this unexpected show of generosity. "Do you intend to vote the money," he inquired suspiciously, "before you look

[3] *Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry Third Duke of Grafton*, ed. Sir William H. Anson (London, 1898), p 202.

[4] *The Parliamentary History of England*, ed. William Cobbett (London, 1806-20), XVI, 535.

[5] Sir Henry Cavendish, *Debates of the House of Commons during the Thirteenth Parliament of Great Britain*, ed. John Wright (London, 1841-43), I, 120.

into the accounts?"[6] After being pushed, North admitted that this was his intention. His agreeing to the motion was an evasion of the issue Opposition meant to raise: that the bills should be examined *before* money was granted to pay them.

Lord North's procedural tactics of evasion: stratagems of avoiding debate altogether and maneuvers to avoid debating the issues proposed, were relatively obvious. Somewhat more subtle were his methods of shifting ground during the debate itself. One of the most serious charges that Opposition brought against the Administration was that it had seated Colonel Luttrell instead of John Wilkes, who had polled the most votes. Since that act on the part of the government had been unprecedented, North was hard put for a reply, and so he answered instead his own deliberate misunderstanding of Opposition's argument:

> Sir, will gentlemen say, that the business of the nation ought to be at a stand, whenever a member is under arrest? I have known members to be under arrest; and, consequently, the House not being complete, according to this excellent, wise, constitutional doctrine . . . all the acts passed during that time were totally null and void. To what, Sir, does this doctrine go? As far as I can see, it goes to annul the whole statute book.[7]

If Opposition had been arguing that the Parliament was null because Wilkes was under arrest rather than because Luttrell had been seated in his place, North's powerful little *reductio ad absurdum* would have been more to the point.

When Edmund Burke proposed an inquiry into the employment of military force in suppressing a riot in St. George's Fields, North subtly shifted ground by giving the word "inquiry" a narrower meaning than Burke had intended: "Sir, that unfortunate affair was inquired into, at the time of the trial of Mr. Gillam [who had ordered the soldiers to fire] and it is scarcely sufficient to say he was acquitted."[8] The inquiry into the actions of one Gillam was not the sweeping inquiry into the practices of the Administration that Burke had had in mind.

Sometimes North was able to shift ground by pretending that his opponent had adopted a more rigorous position than he really had, as he did when he replied to Burke's proposals that those ministers responsible for the excesses committed by the troops be removed from office: "If he seriously means that the committee should countenance . . . the riots which took place during the last year, it will then be our duty to make it a question, whether the military ought, in any case of riot, to be called out."[9] Burke had proposed to debate the question of the improper use of troops rather than of forbidding the use of them, as he had specified in his motion. The extreme construction which North put on Burke's position was obviously easier to refute than the one which Burke had intended.

Sometimes North was able to shift by assuming that his opponent intended a less rigorous meaning, as he did in reply to George Grenville, who had declared: "I am not one of those who thinks the house has a right to call for [accounts of] expenses; provided always, there is not a suspicion that it is applied to improper purposes."[10] He meant that there was suspicion of improper use of the money and that the House ought to inquire. But North in the professed innocence of his con-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 269.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 521.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 326.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 327.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 273.

science, assumed that Grenville did not: "We agree in our notions . . . that whenever there is a well-grounded suspicion, parliament has a right to inquire; but that parliament will never inquire, unless there is such suspicion."[11]

Lord North made use of another kind of semantic dodge in the debate on the opening day of Parliament, January 9, 1770, when the Opposition raised the issue of the threatened war with France. Hostilities would certainly create a demand for the return to office of Chatham, one of the greatest of war ministers. Colonel Barré, one of Chatham's chief supporters in the House of Commons, tried to impale North on the horns of a dilemma: "My meaning is, that you declare before this House, whether all is fair with France? whether France does not threaten hostilities, unless servile submissions are made on the part of Great Britain."[12] North took advantage of the vagueness of Barré's language and turned the question into a more important one: Is there an immediate likelihood of war? "We have at this instant," he replied, "no particular contest, about which there is a probability of going suddenly to war with France. Is that fair?"[13] North's clincher, "Is that fair?" could be taken in two ways: 1) if we are in no immediate danger of war, is not all fair with France? or 2) have I not given you a fair reply? Either interpretation allowed a semantic dodge. Barré did not return to the attack and apparently North was satisfied that he had submerged his opponent, for later in the same debate he declared: "This charge happily for the accused, was urged with a pertinency that drew out an answer direct, full, and explicit, an answer which, when our adversary had clamourously demanded if all was fair, he could not deny to be a fair answer."[14] One wonders if this semantic evasion was not consciously employed or if North honestly believed that his answer was "direct, full, and explicit."

Not all of North's replies were evasive. Sometimes he met a charge head-on, ignoring its peripheral implications and seeking out its center. When George Grenville charged that the increase in the numbers of revenue collectors had unconstitutionally added to the influence of the Crown, North did not deny that there had been an increase nor that it was unconstitutional. He pointed instead to the cause: "Wars . . . have occasioned taxes; those taxes have added to the number of collectors; and those collectors have increased the influence of the Crown. War, and the friends of war, have been the real cause of this increase."[15] Thus North put the blame on the Seven Years' War, during which one of his chief opponents, Chatham, had been in charge of Administration. And he meant by "friends of war" the various factions in Opposition, all of whom were advocating a saber-rattling policy toward France. Showing that one's adversaries are the cause of the evils they allege, falls into the category of solid argument.

The most impressive rebuttal technique that North employed was his quoting of precedents. No other member of the House could equal his ready recall of minutiae, and during one debate he outquoted George Grenville, a former Prime Minister who was considered to be one of the greatest experts on the English constitution:

Grenville: The noble lord follows the precedent of 1721. Now, Sir in the message sent down this

[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *Parliamentary History*, XVI, 707.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 716.
[15] Cavendish, *Debates*, I, 298.

day, I waited to see if there was the same expression. In the message of 1721, the King promises he will cause a retrenchment to be made of his civil list for the future. Is there a word that marks this in the present message?[16]

North: Now, Sir, with regard to the message of 1721, though the King in that instance promised to retrench, the honourable gentleman, familiar as he is with the journals of the House, well knows that in April 1725, four years after, there came a fresh application to this House, in which the King did not promise to retrench.[17]

Grenville: Here, Sir, we are about to make another untoward precedent. It is henceforth to be a precedent that when a message comes down to us from the Crown, we are instantly to comply with it.[18]

North: But, Sir, with regard to the precedent, the honourable gentleman says, that this is an unhappy precedent, that we ought not to establish: why, one in Queen Anne's reign and two in the reign of George the First are all precedents in point.[19]

This kind of refutation was most effective with North's audience on the benches of the House because of the great value they placed on making decisions consistent with their traditions, and it constituted the most solid kind of argument that any parliamentary speaker could use.

Lord North occasionally used the strategy of dividing and conquering the various factions among his Opposition, but he rarely practiced it so overtly as he did during the debate on Edmund Burke's motion for an inquiry into the causes of disorders in America, on May 9, 1770: "If the plan of the gentlemen is one that is to restore peace to America, they should not bring it forward until they have determined what administration shall follow. Is it to be the one that proposed the stamp act [Grenville's]; or the one that repealed it [Rockingham's]?"[20] Actually, North's entire program, which drew heavily on the policies of Grenville's former administration, had the effect of dividing Opposition. If North had attempted too transparently to drive wedges between the parties aligned against him, the result could have been to draw them closer together. We should include among North's techniques of rebuttal his avoiding such arguments as might have endangered his long-range goals. His genial manner toward his political opponents probably did more to maintain serious differences of opinion among them than any arguments he might have hurled.

The fact that North did not strike back when members of Opposition made stinging personal remarks (Burke once compared him to a prostitute) indicates further that he knew how to control his tongue. When he first began speaking in the House, he had had some difficulty in holding his temper in check, and even after he became Leader of the House he sometimes in the heat of debate used rash expressions for which he had to apologize. On November 23, 1768, for instance, he admitted this fault: "I have already troubled the House with my opinion . . . perhaps with some warmth, which has fallen under censure";[21] and on the following December 7th, he had to explain again: "As to my saying, that I would not yield until I saw America prostrate under my foot, I could only mean, by the expression, until America has submitted to the laws. Words may be spoken in heat: it is not from hasty expressions, but from measures, that public men are to be judged."[22] But North quickly corrected his fault. During the crisis of 1770, when Opposition speakers were especially virulent toward him, I do not discover

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 272.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 272.
[20] *Ibid.*, II, 31.
[21] *Ibid.*, I, 65.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

a single instance in which he paid them back in their own coin. Even on those rare occasions when his reply involved the personality of the member he was answering, his attention seems to have been focused on the argument rather than on the person. Several Opposition speakers used savage language, and the violence with which they traduced North took them, in a vicious circle, into even greater difficulties, for most members of the House deplored undue warmth—though they enjoyed invective when the speaker was good at it. North's urbane composure under withering attack was no inconsiderable asset in the estimation of an audience which was fond of steady men.

Although North developed distinguished parliamentary ability, ability alone could not insure an enduring ministry. One of the reasons for North's stable government was that nearly everybody liked him. "Mr. Gulston," Nichols writes, "was returned member for Poole [in 1780]; he had attached himself strongly to Lord North; in his politics he was a staunch Whig, and no friend of Government, though he adhered to Lord North while he was Minister."[23] The word "gentleman," writes Butler, "was never applied to any person in a higher degree, or more generally, than it was to lord North, and to all he said or did in the house of commons."[24]

Lord North, who had to be on his feet more often than any other man, knew better than to try the patience of the House by speaking longer than necessary. The most striking aspect of his style is his economy of language. In the completeness of his argument, North most resembles George Grenville, but in the matter of economy, the two men are poles apart; Grenville was verbose, expansive, and boring, while North was concise, trenchant, and entertaining. His ability to turn the tables on his opponents, often in the space of a sentence or two, contributed to his reputation for wit and must have delighted especially those who were already his partisans. In other respects, North's style is hardly distinguishable on the printed page from that of any of the other speakers except Burke, whose language was often highly metaphorical. North rarely made use of imagery or figures of speech, and when he did, he kept them subdued.

It was no small advantage to North that he had a "memory so retentive as to enable him to recollect every point that had been argued in the course of a debate."[25] Sometimes he remembered an argument more accurately than the speaker who had made it. For example on January 9, 1770, he repeated, as was his custom, the gist of his opponent's argument before proceeding to refute it:

> It has been said [by Colonel Barré] that the measures of the present ministry have been so arbitrary and corrupt, that they have alienated the affections of thirteen millions of faithful subjects from an amiable sovereign, and in order to blacken the servants of the crown a treasonable representation is given of disloyalty in the people, who, without excepting a single individual, are represented as ripe for a rebellion.[26]

The *Parliamentary History* reports that at this point

> Colonel Barré stood up, and taking the allusion to himself, denied his having represented the affections of thirteen millions as alienated from

[23] John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1817-58), V, 29-30.

[24] Charles Butler, *Reminiscences of Charles Butler, Esq.* (London, 1824), p. 156.

[25] John Heneage Jesse, *Memoirs of the Life and Reign of King George the Third* (Boston, n.d.), II, 205.

[26] *Parliamentary History*, XVI, 716.

their Sovereign.[27] Lord North insisted upon the charge[s], and appealed to the House. . . . Colonel Barré persisted in denying them, and asked if any gentleman remembered them, or had taken them down; a member near him explained them, and another repeated them, exactly as from his notes. Colonel Barré then retracted his appeal, and had again recourse to his own assertions, saying his *ipse dixit* was as good as any man's and being greatly moved, lord North dropped the dispute and proceeded.[28]

In this instance, North had remembered Barré's earlier argument nearly verbatim, even though Barré himself had apparently forgotten, or did not care to remember, what he had said.

Except in his budget speeches, North almost never used notes. Butler says the quickness of North's mind seemed like intuition. The Earl of Sandwich once said to Butler, "I must have pen and ink, and write down and ruminate: give lord North a bundle of papers, and he'll turn them over,—perhaps, while his hair is dressing; and he instantly knows their contents and bearings."[29]

Horace Walpole writes that North had many useful talents, "wit, good-humour, strong natural sense, assurance, and promptness both of conception and elocution" but that "nothing could be more coarse or clumsy or ungracious than his outside. Two large prominent eyes that rolled about to no purpose (for he was utterly short-sighted), a wide mouth, thick lips, and inflated visage, gave him the air of a blind trumpeter."[30] Wraxall writes that "in speaking, walking, and every motion, it is not enough to say that he wanted grace; he was to the last degree awkward."[31] His deep voice which Burke once compared to thunder, "instead of modulating, he enforced with unnecessary pomp."[32] His tongue, which was too large for his mouth, "rendered his articulation somewhat thick, though not at all indistinct."[33] Both his pompous manner and his large tongue suggest that his rate of delivery was slow, and his deep booming voice could probably be heard easily in the farthest corners of the House. Walpole noted that North "ignored every civil attention," a trait that may be explained by Wraxall's comment that "even at the distance of a few feet, he saw very imperfectly, and across the House he was unable to distinguish persons with any degree of certainty."[34] Deprived of those visual cues upon which speakers depend to gauge audience reactions, North had to be especially careful to avoid giving offense as he spoke.

Although Lord North was a conservative and although he advocated a policy of firmness, he was not an autocrat. There were large and respectable factions in the House which enjoined more rigorous measures than he. George Grenville, for instance, censured him for not taking military action sooner against the Wilkes mobs, and advocated at least as unyielding a policy toward the Americans as the one that North endorsed. Horace Walpole repeatedly praised North for his prudence.[35] Samuel Johnson, whose views can be accepted as the extreme of the Tory position, often complained that North's government was feeble and timid. "Were I in power," he declared on one oc-

[27] The *Parliamentary History* reports that Barré had said, earlier in this debate: "Administration must certainly be erroneous, or corrupt in no small degree, which has alienated the affections of thirteen millions of faithful subjects, from an amiable sovereign." (*Ibid.*, p. 705).

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 716-17.

[29] Butler, *Reminiscences*, p. 157.

[30] *Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third*, ed. Sir Denis Le Marchant (London, 1845), IV, 78-79.

[31] Wraxall, *Memoirs*, I, 362.

[32] Walpole, *Memoirs of George the Third*, IV, 79.

[33] Wraxall, Memoirs, I, 362.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Walpole, *Memoirs of George the Third*, I, 84.

casion, "I would turn out every man who dared to oppose me. Government has the distribution of offices, that it may be enabled to maintain its authority."[36] Johnson once said that if he were in charge of American affairs, "the first thing he would do, would be to quarter the army on the citys, and if any refused free quarters, he would pull down that person's house, if it was joyned to other houses, but would burn it if it stood alone. This and other schemes he proposed in the manuscript of his *Taxation no Tyranny*, but these, he said, the Ministry expunged."[37] It was not North's conservatism or arbitrariness that drew down the wrath of Opposition so much as his willingness to serve a king-centered administration and his insistence that his former colleagues give up the luxury of annually tearing down whatever government happened to be in power. And this he did with the voting support of the King's Friends and the Bedfords, who had been even more unyielding toward John Wilkes and the American colonies than Grenville.

Although North discreetly "worked the press" through the efforts of such worthies as Samuel Johnson, he considered his important audience the one inside the House of Commons; and a most difficult one it was. Its members collectively knew everything worth knowing about everything with which a legislature must concern itself. They did not hesitate to call attention to misstatements of fact; against every argument that a debater advanced, his opponent would ably place its counter; and all the members were capable of almost any discourtesy to a speaker who tried their patience. As Leader of the House, North had to speak frequently and well, for no ministry, no matter how initially well disposed and numerous its partisans, could hope to continue without effective direction. "The House of Commons must be managed," Horace Walpole remarked in 1767. "If left to themselves they will exert their freedom, though it be only to choose a new master."[38] The House, which would not move without a rider, would not hesitate to throw him off if he proved inept. What was needed was a light but flexibly firm touch. This North had.

He replied to only those arguments the Opposition brought up, probably because he did not wish to call attention to arguments that might not otherwise be used. He characteristically delayed his rebuttal in the debate until he could discern the main lines of attack, and he let the sleeping dogs lie. This is not to say he never attacked arguments the Opposition had not maintained. Sometimes he did so, as has already been shown; but when he chose this course his purpose was usually to evade some other argument that had been offered and to give his supporters the impression that he had answered it. Logically, such defense is futile; practically, it has a good chance of success if the opponents are not quick to see through it and equal to the difficult task of exposing it.

In debate the defense has four methods at its disposal: 1) destroy the contention that evils exist, 2) constructively demonstrate that things are all right as they are, 3) admit the evils but contend that nothing should be done about them, and 4) make a counter-proposition. North's strategy combined the first and fourth methods. It was his basic contention that there

[36] James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill, rev. and enl. L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1934-50), II, 335.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

[38] *Horace Walpole's Letters*, ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee (Oxford, 1903-05), VII, 89.

were no major issues before the country except those which the Opposition had trumped up:

> Every thing has been done to stir up the minds of the people, and keep them in a constant state of faction.[39]

> Motions must be made because ministers must be blamed.[40]

The underlying reason for the disorders, he contended, was that there had been no firm, consistent government:

> A great portion of the present evils have arisen from the wavering conduct of this country.[41]

> The disorders of the times have been attributed to want of firmness in the administration.[42]

> Those repeated changes of administration have been the principal cause of the present grievance.[43]

Opposition's fundamental contention had been that, for various reasons, North's government should be overthrown. According to the theory of debate, the defense counter-proposal, to be effective, must be utterly inconsistent with the one advanced by the attacker. North's could hardly have been more preclusive, for he advocated, simply, that his administration be continued in power in order to maintain a policy of firmness and consistency:

> The present ministers . . . are determined to support the authority of government, though people should stir up a civil war in the country: they are prepared to meet the roughest storm, that faction or ambition can stir up.[44]

> It is a serious consideration, that it should be seen that government can continue in the same hands for six months.[45]

We have seen North's various techniques of defense: his keeping embarrassing issues from reaching the floor of the House whenever he could, his skill in shifting the point at issue to more favorable ground, and his methods of rebuttal. Except for his budget speeches, and a few others, he rarely made a constructive proposal; his speeches were almost all in reply and were designed to destroy a proposition advanced by the Opposition. Yet, paradoxically, his program was essentially more constructive than Opposition's, and therein lay his strength. His primary purpose was to stabilize the government by embarking on no new projects and by holding a moderate but firm line on the old ones. Opposition, on the other hand, meant to upset North's government as it had upset every other government since the accession of George III—and this with no assurance to the country that any new arrangement on their part could succeed any better than their former ones. It was in response to this essentially negative effort on the part of the forces aligned against him that Lord North adopted his posture of defense.

[39] Cavendish, *Debates*, I, 547.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 88.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 232.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 298.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 108.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

THE DRAMATIC CRITICISM OF ORATORY

Barnet Baskerville

ON the 19th of April 1951, General Douglas MacArthur, having recently been relieved of his command as head of the United Nations forces in Korea, strode into the House chamber in Washington, D. C. to deliver a speech to a Joint Meeting of Congress and, by radio and television, to the American people. Most of what General MacArthur said on that historic occasion has long since been forgotten, but the electric impact of his address upon the nation may be readily recalled. Within a few hours the national news services had carried word to all the land that the General had "achieved his greatest personal glory," that his speech was "a masterpiece of eloquence," and that war-hardened soldiers, callous politicians, and blasé reporters had unashamedly wept. Even the decorous *Christian Science Monitor,* which was by no means carried away by the speech, noted that "a semicircle of gold-braided generals and admirals sat just under the rostrum," and as MacArthur uttered his peroration "the press gallery noted that half a dozen of them were wiping tears from their eyes, or swabbing their faces unaffectedly."[1]

Such accounts were, of course, immediate reaction to a highly dramatic situation, on-the-spot reporting the enthusiasm of which was as yet unmitigated by reflection. Nevertheless, the weekly periodicals, with from eight to ten days to cool off, struck much the same note. *Newsweek, U. S. News and World Report, Time,* and *Life* all gave prominence to the fact that the audience was moved to tears. *Time's* report gave detailed stage directions from the moment the doorkeeper announced the distinguished speaker, to his final word, "Goodbye."

> In a great wave, the applause and cheers burst upon the erect figure who strode down the aisle.
>
> He stood in a trim Eisenhower jacket without ribbons or medals, back rigid, his face stony.
>
> As silence fell, he began to speak slowly, in a deep resonant voice.
>
> Applause interrupted him again and again—some 30 times in all.
>
> As he spoke, MacArthur kept his hands firmly anchored to each end of the lectern.
>
> He dropped his voice a little, and went on.

Of the "old soldier" peroration *Time* remarked: "It was a spine-tingling and theatrical climax, audaciously beyond the outer limits of ordinary present-day oratory. In the wild crash of applause, many a legislative eye was wet. So were many other eyes across the land."[2] *Times's* sister publication, *Life,* reported that Americans everywhere "were magnetized by the vibrant voice, the dramatic rhetoric and the Olympian personality of the most controversial military hero of our times."[3] The *Nation,* traditionally no admirer of MacArthur, observed: "Dramatically, the speech was a re-

Mr. Baskerville (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1948), Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, presented a paper on the present subject at the SAA convention in Boston in August 1957. His annual reviews of the regional speech journals have appeared in QJS *for the past two years.*

[1] *Christian Science Monitor,* April 20, 1951.

[2] *Time,* LVII (April 30, 1951), 21-23.

[3] *Life,* XXX (April 30, 1951), 23.

markable achievement, and the millions who heard it over the radio were deeply stirred. The man's magnetism was apparent the instant he entered the House. . . . It was at least a performance of which a veteran actor could have been proud."[4]

The comments just cited are obviously selected to make a point. The point is that General MacArthur's address to Congress elicited, perhaps more than any other speech in recent times, a remarkable body of descriptive and critical comment regarding the dramatic aspects of the speaking situation—the speaker's regal bearing, his resonant voice, his personal magnetism, and his effect upon those who heard him.[5] I have called attention to the comment evoked by this particular speech because it is so unusual. It is not often that modern observers are moved in reporting and evaluating a public speech to comment in detail upon techniques of presentation or upon the observable effects on members of the audience. We have become accustomed to reports which deal almost exclusively with what the speaker said and what the critic thought about what was said. But this has not always been so in America. In the last century (and in the early part of this one) the type of comment called forth by MacArthur's speech was more the rule than the exception.

Nearly everyone is familiar with Professor Herbert Wichelns' classic essay in which he analyzed the criticism of oratory in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and found it to be principally "literary" in its approach.[6] That is to say, it tended to treat speeches as literary forms similar to essays, and to assess such "literary" qualities as permanence and stylistic excellence. Wichelns censured most critics for failing to recognize the orator's art for what it is, "the art of influencing men in some concrete situation." He did not pretend to offer a pronouncement upon all, or even most, of the criticism of the period. He proposed modestly "to see what some critics have said of some orators." His investigation was explicitly limited to criticism of six speakers, four of them British. Examination of the essay reveals that fully half the sources of criticism are also British.

It is the purpose of this article to see what *other* critics have said of orators and oratory during the same period. It proposes to demonstrate that much criticism of oratory at this time was of quite a different nature—that it dealt not with the literary merits of the speech, but with the histrionic prowess of the speaker. This article, it is scarcely necessary to say, is designed not in any sense as a refutation of, but rather as a supplement to, the earlier essay.

This other kind of criticism which, taking our cue from Wichelns' title, we might call the "dramatic" or "histrionic" criticism of oratory, was also, like the criticism condemned by Wichelns, a distortion of what most of us now believe rhetorical criticism properly should be. But the abuses of which it was guilty were the result of considering the speaker *as a speaker* (or

[4] Willard Shelton, "MacArthur Joins the G. O. P.," Nation, CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 389.

[5] I do not wish to imply that all, or even most, of the comment was of this kind, for the substance of the speech was carefully analyzed and its arguments and implications thoughtfully discussed.

[6] Herbert Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216; reprinted in *The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama Presented to Herbert August Wichelns*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca and London, 1958), pp. 5-42.

more accurately, as a performer), and not as a writer of literature. This sort of criticism is to be found primarily in an impressive number of essays and periodical articles describing oratory in terms of its dramatic aspects, and in a series of books and articles devoted to evaluation of individual orators. Professor Wichelns, it will be recalled, observed that "we have not much serious criticism of oratory." Since the criticism appraised in his essay is taken entirely from books, and since he makes no reference to periodicals, it is possible that he did not consider the kind of material we are discussing here as "serious criticism," and in most cases we might be forced to agree (though the critics themselves were intensely serious about their work). But there is ample evidence that it was far more frequently engaged in, and impinged upon far more people in this country than did so-called "literary" criticism of oratory. As such, it is worthy of our attention.

Oratory as Performance

The most striking feature of the commentary upon orators and oratory here under discussion is its view of public speaking as a grand performance in which, in one way or another, one man renders an audience completely malleable to his will. He may weave a magic spell, he may charm them into willing acquiescence, or he may dominate them by sheer force of personality. But *rule them* he must. "Oratory is the masterful art," said Judge David Brewer in his preface to ten volumes of the *World's Best Orations*.[7] "Poetry, painting, music, sculpture, architecture please, thrill, inspire; but oratory rules. The orator dominates those who hear him. . . . He sways his audience as the storm bends the branches of the forest." Senator George F. Hoar, writing in *Scribner's* magazine in 1901, paid a stirring tribute to the orator, who, he said, "must be able to play at will on the mighty organ, his audience, of which human souls are the keys. . . . He must have, in perfection, the eye and the voice which are the only and natural avenues by which one human soul can enter into and subdue another."[8] The Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, in his little book *Oratory*, described as "crowned" and "regal" the sensations of a speaker who faces an audience in a worthy cause and defies, fights, controls, and conquers them.[9]

These connoisseurs of oratory had a distinctive vocabulary of their own. While moderates among them described the orator's triumphs in terms of "mastery," "magnetism," "charm," and "eloquence," the more exuberant employed such colorful phrases as "necromantic power," "Sibylline frenzy," "divine flashes," and "volcanic fires of genius." By their standards the ultimate in oratorical mastery was reached at such moments as when Fisher Ames, speaking against the British Treaty, left his listeners "unable to think, able only to feel"; or when Patrick Henry, arguing against the parsons, rendered the jury "so bewildered as to lose sight of the legislative enactments on which the plaintiffs relied," and caused the court to lose "the equipoise of its judgment" so that it refused a new trial.[10]

Audiences, if we may judge from the tone of much published comment, were perfectly willing to be so played upon. U. S. Supreme Court Justice Brewer says of the orator: "How completely we

[7] *World's Best Orations* (St. Louis, 1899), I, ix.

[8] "Oratory," *Scribner's*, XXIX (June 1901), 756.

[9] *Oratory* (Philadelphia, 1893), p. 47.

[10] William Mathews, *Oratory and Orators* (Chicago, 1879), pp. 17-18.

lose ourselves and yield in willing submission to the imperious and impetuous flow of his speech."[11] An anonymous writer in the *Universalist Quarterly* some thirty years previously is even more explicit:

> This is the secret of true eloquence and of every great orator's art;—that we become absorbed in him and in his subject so that *we lose all control of ourselves;* that we not only obey his slightest nod and gentlest as well as most imperious command, but that *we love to have it so.*[12]

Elias Magoon, writing at mid-century, expresses an almost identical sentiment:

> The auditor *loves to yield himself* up to the fascination of a rich, mellow voice, a commanding attitude, and a brilliant physiognomy . . . He blends all his emotions with the speaker, and is subdued or inspired under his power. He soon becomes stripped of all defence, and *willingly exposed* to every blow, so that the greatest effects are produced by the slightest words adroitly directed and skillfully expressed.[13]

This attitude on the part of the listener resembles "that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment" which Coleridge described in another connection, and which in this instance constitutes *oratorical,* rather than *poetic,* faith. Apparently the audience, like Coleridge's reader of poetry, was willing to be fooled momentarily for the sake of the aesthetic pleasure to be derived.

Evaluations of Individual Orators

The foregoing quotations will perhaps suffice to convey the flavor of much nineteenth-century commentary upon the art of oratory. We turn now to attempts during the same period to present critical evaluations of individual speakers—such work as, for example, Magoon's *Orators of the American Revolution* (1848), Harsha's *Orators and Statesmen* (1854), Parker's *The Golden Age of American Oratory* (1857), and Mathews' *Oratory and Orators* (1879).

Turning the pages of these and similar volumes, one finds oneself not only in a different century, but in a different world. The language is different of course—ornate, self-conscious, figurative, abounding in classical allusion which is sometimes pertinent, more often merely ostentatious. But differences in literary style are to be expected. It is the marked difference in spirit, in attitude toward the object of criticism, that is even more striking. These critics approach their subjects with the same gaping reverence which moved Congressman Short to observe after the MacArthur speech, "We saw a great hunk of God in the flesh, and we heard the voice of God."[14] Our nineteenth-century critics would not have expressed it so vulgarly, but the spirit would have been much the same.

We have already referred to Professor Wichelns' strictures on the criticism he examined in 1925. The biographical critics, he said, treated the speaker as something other than a speaker; the stylistic critics ignored the presence of an audience and approached a speech as if it were a written composition. On the other hand, Wichelns praised writers like Morley and Goodrich because they wrote of the orator "as a public man whose function it is to exert his influence by speech."[15] Now the writers we are considering in this paper were clearly (and almost exclusively) interested in speakers *as speakers;* they certainly were not unaware of the pres-

[11] *World's Best Orations,* I, x.
[12] "Eloquence, Its Principles," *Universalist Quarterly,* XX (Jan. 1863), 30. Italics mine.
[13] Elias L. Magoon, *Orators of the American Revolution* (New York, 1848), p. 137. Italics mine.
[14] *Congressional Record.* 82nd Cong. 1st sess., Vol. 97, Pt. 3, p. 4129.
[15] Wichelns, p. 208.

ence and importance of an *audience;* and they did not confuse a speech with an essay, for they were continually proclaiming the superiority of the speech *heard* over the speech *read.* Nevertheless, these men were as far from Wichelns' ideal of a rhetorical critic as were the literary men he condemned. For while they would doubtless have agreed with him that the orator's function is to exert influence through speech, they would have meant not the influence upon public thought and action exerted by the speaker's ideas, but rather a kind of dramatic influence-for-its-own-sake. Whereas the concern of the rhetorical critic (to use Wichelns' words) "is with the ideas of the people as influenced by their leaders," the concern of these men I have somewhat facetiously termed "dramatic" critics seems to have been with the emotions of the people as manipulated by their masters.

These men were more interested in histrionics than history. "Assembled multitudes," one of them wrote, "love that which dazzles them, which moves, strikes, and enchains them."[16] This same writer, after stating that "The true test of oratorical merit lies in thought, and not in words," proceeds to write two books with scarcely another reference to any orator's thought. He does not mention what James Otis said against the writs of assistance, but he describes in detail how he said whatever it was he said. Otis was a "flame of fire"; he "kindled a conflagration destined to sunder every fetter."[17] His words "were like bolts of granite heated in a volcano and shot forth with unerring aim, crashing where they fell."[18] E. G. Parker, author of *The Golden Age of American Oratory,* went to the Senate gallery as to the theater, to watch the performance. Let him tell about it:

> Webster, Calhoun, Clay, in the American Senate! How grand a vision that was! No spectacle of physical grandeur or splendor, to our eyes, could compare with that scene of surpassing moral interest. We have spent whole hours, when nothing but dry routine business was in progress in the Senate, in gazing upon them there. . . . That *was* a Senate.[19]

These words were written in 1857, but abundant evidence of this same enthusiasm for the drama of oratory continued to appear throughout the century and beyond. In 1879 a book bearing the title *Acting and Oratory* was published in which it was affirmed that *"a good orator* needs precisely the same requisites that are claimed for a *good actor,"* and that *"Acting* ought to be considered as really the foundation of *Oratory."*[20] And in the late nineties, articles were still appearing in the national journals with such titles as "Happy Hits in Oratory," which related with gusto anecdotes of exciting moments on the platform when a great orator, with flashing eye and in deep organ tones, hurled thunderbolts which overwhelmed his opponent and entranced his auditors.

Space permits only one brief example of this histrionic approach to criticism, though similar illustrations might be cited from nearly every page of some of the sources mentioned.

Henry Clay was a particular favorite of the connoisseurs of oratory; their prose takes on a purple glow when they describe his artistry. "When Clay spoke," said eyewitness Edward G. Parker,

> he was often in a physical fever; as he went on, some great thought would strike athwart

[16] Magoon, p. 91.
[17] *Ibid.,* p. 69.
[18] *Ibid.,* p. 92.

[19] Edward G. Parker, *The Golden Age of American Oratory* (Boston, 1857), pp. 119-120.
[20] J. E. Frobisher, *Acting and Oratory* (New York, 1879), p. 6.

his mind, or some great vision flash upon his fancy . . . and then—heavens! how the blood mounted glistening in his broad, bright face and gushing on his burning brain. Then that homely physiognomy would be, in an instant, illuminated with a sort of oratorical sunshine; the spirit of a commanding grace would descend upon him, almost it would seem as if a halo hovered round his head, and with an apostolic beauty it were absolutely transfigured.[21]

Of Clay's voice, Parker has this to say:

It touched every note in the whole gamut of human susceptibilities; it was sweet, and soft, and lulling as a mother's to her babe. It could be made to float into the chambers of the ear, as gently as descending snow-flakes on the sea; and again it shook the Senate, stormy, brain-shaking, filling the air with its absolute thunders. . . . Musical yet mighty, that marvellous organ ranged over all levels, from the diapason organ tone to the alto shriek; from the fine delicacies of pathetic inflections, to the drum-beat rolls of denunciatory intonations.[22]

And what were the effects wrought by this wondrously adaptable voice and this commanding presence? Parker tells of an occasion when Clay made a fellow Senator the victim of his eloquence. At the climax of his speech Clay glared into the eye of his luckless colleague and

then, with all his accumulated concentration of power, he hurled the last thunder-bolt sentence upon him, as if he would strike death to his heart.

The oratorical cannonade was too tremendous to be endured, and the Senator, leaving his chair, walked round behind the Vice-President's desk; where the Corinthian pillars and ample curtains, hiding him from that brandishing arm and accusatorial eye, shrouded him as in some tranquil haven, from the terrors of the tempest.[23]

Now, whatever one may think of this kind of thing, one will be forced to agree that it is certainly not *literary* criticism of oratory!

[21] Parker, p. 35.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

Conclusion

Our purpose in this brief discussion has been to demonstrate that, whatever Professor Wichelns found to be true of the criticism which he examined,[24] the errors of a substantial body of nineteenth century American criticism (if errors they be) lay not in a failure to distinguish between oratory and literature, but in a failure to distinguish between the orator and the actor. These critics were more interested in the speaker than the speech. The startling aspects of delivery occupied the center of their attention. Style was often analyzed in detail, but it was style as an adjunct to delivery, an aid to stimulating an audience, rather than as that which imparted a "literary" quality. Invention was either ignored or relegated to a subordinate position.

It is well to remember, however, that oratory in the nineteenth century was regarded as a fine art—to be seriously cultivated as such, and to be enjoyed and appreciated as such. It is not strange, therefore, that critical comment upon oratory should have reflected this attitude. And since oratory as a fine art partakes of the elements of both literature and drama, it is understandable that some critics chose to emphasize its literary, and others its dramatic aspects. Nor is it remarkable that this writing should have been subjective and impressionistic; the impressionistic approach to literature had numerous American adherents, particularly during the latter part of the century, when the influence of such

[24] It might be observed that since many of Wichelns' sources were "literary" (*i.e.*, numerous histories of American and British literature, literary essays, and biographies with such titles as *Lincoln as a Man of Letters* and *Daniel Webster as a Master of English Style*), it is not surprising that they should have emphasized the literary aspects of oratory.

writers as Anatole France and Walter Pater was being felt in this country.[25]

We may be unfair in attempting to impose on these writers twentieth-century standards which reflect our conception of oratory as primarily a useful art. Effusive as their evaluations may sound to the modern ear, and unacceptable as their subjectivity and extravagance may be to the modern mind, our comment upon their criticism might better be *de*scriptive than *pre*scriptive or *pro*scriptive. Then, as now, theory, criticism, and practice worked hand in hand. Critics admired what it was fashionable to admire, and in a manner acceptable at the time. Speakers obliged by producing oratory of the kind that was admired. Rhetoricians and schoolmasters observed great orators in action and formulated principles on the basis of what they saw. In such a continuous chain it is impossible to distinguish cause from effect; all were causes and all effects. Each acted on the other, and together they contributed to the forming of public taste, to establishing the fashion.

All of which is to say that, given what we know of the nature of much nineteenth-century speaking, it would have been strange if there had *not* been considerable "dramatic" as well as "literary" criticism of oratory.

[25] Joel E. Spingarn's description of the impressionistic critic of literature is well known: "To have sensations in the presence of a work of art and to express them, that is the function of Criticism for the impressionistic critic. His attitude he would express somewhat in this fashion. . . . , 'My delight . . . is itself a judgment, and what better judgment is it possible for me to give? All that I can do is to tell how it affects me, what sensations it gives me.'" *Creative Criticism* (New York, 1917), pp. 5-6. The writers we have discussed were expressing their sensations in the presence of what they clearly regarded as works of art.

FROM IOWA TO GREECE: THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GEORGE CRAM COOK

Arthur E. Waterman

WHEN *The Road to the Temple,* Susan Glaspell's biography of her husband George Cram Cook, appeared in 1927, the critics spent more time reviewing Cook's life than Miss Glaspell's book. Since Cook had written little of literary value,[1] they had to examine the meaning of his life. They were able to point out that Cook's major contribution to American literary development was his establishment and leadership of the Provincetown Players from 1915 to 1922. They knew that Cook had been the inspiration behind the development of the American playwright, chiefly O'Neill and Miss Glaspell, for which the Provincetown was famous. As long as they discussed his inspired leadership of our most important little theatre, the critics were dealing with well-known fact, but Miss Glaspell's book was about Cook's "pilgrimage" from Iowa to Greece and about his visionary character as it had been expressed for half a century. She exalted his life of fits and starts, made up of too much drinking and such disjointed activities as bird training and amateur sculpture. She spoke movingly of Cook's last year in Greece where he had fled after the Provincetown closed in 1922, but the over-all impression of Cook one gained from her book was of an idealistic genius who somehow had never been as creative or important as he should have been. Thus the critics were forced not only to praise Cook's accomplishment at the Provincetown but to assess the unique character of his life.

They came to some strange and contradictory conclusions. The English reviewers were struck by the American traits of Cook's life. The reviewer for *Spectator* wrote, "We may like it or not, but it is conclusively and irrefutably American. . . . Here is something of the Western pioneer linked up with the modern point of view."[2] The American reviewers were divided between those who had known Cook personally and had come under his spell, and those who had not. Percy Hutchinson called Cook a "Modern Lycidas," but admitted that the book had a meaning that could not be put into words.[3] Floyd Dell, perhaps Cook's closest friend, spoke of his vision: "He quickened with his companionship the sparks of belief and of courage in young minds—belief in the possibility of creating a new world and courage to begin now."[4] On the other hand, Joseph Collins accused Cook of being "a dreamer, an egoist, a victim of emotional infantilism, whose dreams would not come true, whose thoughts

Mr. Waterman is Assistant Professor of English at Central Michigan College, Mount Pleasant, Michigan.

[1] Cook's published works include: *Roderick Taliaferro* (1903), *Evolution and the Superman* (1906), *The Chasm* (1911), *Battle-Hymn of the Workers* (1912), and in 1925 Miss Glaspell published a collection of Cook's poems, *Greek Coins.*

[2] *Spectator,* CXXXVII, Nov. 6, 1926, 821.

[3] Percy Hutchinson, "George Cram Cook was a Modern Lycidas," New York *Times Book Review,* March 13, 1927, p. 2.

[4] Floyd Dell, New York *Herald Tribune Books,* March 13, 1927, p. 2.

were unchiseled, whose endeavor was uncompleted, whose purposes were unfinished; whose dominating fear was death."[5]

Time has not reconciled these differences. Today we acknowledge Cook's leadership of the Provincetown Theatre, but his life remains an anomaly of genius and failure. When talking with people who knew Cook in the old days, one is struck by their immediate reaction: "Oh, Jig was crazy"; then after a pause they add, "but I remember . . . ," and they go on to relate some anecdote showing how his craziness transformed everything he touched. They tell how he grew Midwestern crops in the sandy soil of Cape Cod to the amazement of the natives; how he once tried to steal Plymouth Rock and talked three other men into helping him; how, with John Reed, he inspired a group of unknown artists to form our most important amateur theatre; how he took the entire Provincetown treasury, against all advice, to build a dome for the production of O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones* and brought success to that theatre, and when the Players were a success, Cook disbanded them saying, "What we needed was not a bigger theatre, but a smaller one"; and, finally, how a bird he had once trained in the mountains of Greece flew in his window to be near him the day he died.

This is the legend. But today's reader wants more tangible statements than stories recalled from the golden past. He asks, "What did Cook do that is important?" The answer lies, I believe, in Cook's vision of America and Greece.

As a native Iowan, born in Davenport in 1873, Cook found qualities in the Midwestern pioneer tradition which he felt America should preserve as well as revere. He hated the middle-class provincialism of his day because he felt it was ignoring, if not destroying, the pioneer virtues of integrity and independence. For a while he took up farming in order to identify himself with his ancestors by earning his living as they had. But he didn't want to retreat to the past; he wanted to make the past meaningful to the present, so he left the farm and went to Chicago. There he joined other exiled Midwesterners who had fled the staid small town in order to give expression to their artistic longings. Cook became a part of the so-called Chicago Renaissance and as a reviewer for *The Friday Review* he read and wrote about books that made him feel that literature could be the way of giving meaning to his heritage.

He wrote of the possibilities of an artistic revolt—a fruition of America's destiny created by her artists: "Suppose the nascence depends not on blind evolutionary forces, involving the whole nation, but on whether or not the hundred artists who have in them potential power arrange or do not arrange to place themselves in vital stimulating relationship with each other, in order to bring out, co-ordinate and direct their power."[6]

Since childhood Cook had revered the classical civilization of ancient Greece. He saw the same integrity, heroism, and democratic spirit in Greece that he associated with pioneer life in America. He felt that Greece had proved that man could create a unified culture where the workaday and artistic worlds were united; where the businessmen, artisans, and politicians supported and created the artistic climate; where the

5 Joseph Collins, New York *Evening Post*, VII, April 2, 1927, 2.

6. Quoted in Susan Glaspell, *The Road to the Temple* (New York, 1927), p. 244.

cultural heritage, both real and legendary, formed the basis for art and life. In Greece this way of life had led to a unity symbolized by the theatre which reflected and gave meaning to every aspect of Greek life, whereas in America the pioneer spirit had been replaced by a sterile culture governed by commercialism which shut out the creative voice of the artist. Cook's goal in life was to bring the Hellenic spirit to modern America. He once said to Floyd Dell, "Floyd, let's gather the old Davenport crowd together, and go back there, and make it a new Athens."[7]

When Greenwich Village superseded Chicago as the center for the *avant-garde,* Cook went to New York and shared the Village revolt in life and letters. In the artist colony at Provincetown and in the Village atmosphere, his vision of an artistic flowering became a reality. Cook wrote only a few plays for the Provincetown: *The Athenian Women* (1917), based on Euripides' *The Trojan Women; The Spring* (1921), which presented the consequences of Indian legend on a group of contemporary Americans; and two collaborations with Miss Glaspell, *Suppressed Desires* (1915) and *Tickless Time* (1918). He also directed and acted in a few plays, but his most important job—one he was ideally suited for—was to be the inspiring force behind all the activity. Cook could charm a play from a truck driver, or money from a banker. With his shock of white hair, compelling eyes, and wonderful voice he attracted everyone, so the Provincetown was always filled with his devoted followers.

In spite of the endless production problems, the personality conflicts, the money worries, Cook never lost sight of the Provincetown's essential purpose and never allowed success or failure to dim the light of idealism he nurtured so steadfastly. For he was responsible for the unique character of that theatre which set it apart from the other little theatres of its day. The Provincetown had one basic aim: to give the American playwright a theatre wherein he could work out every phase of his play's production. Cook's faith in the American playwright and his insistence on producing only original plays by American playwrights caused the emergence of the Provincetown Players as a force in the development of the American drama. Although we remember the Provincetown as the theatre that established O'Neill, it would have been important without him because of the new playwrights and plays it fostered[8] and because of the unique ideal it maintained.

The Provincetown became a success in 1920-1921. Of the major plays produced this seventh season (*The Emperor Jones, Inheritors,* and *Aria Da Capo*) only one was by an established playwright; the other two were by unknowns who had been discovered, encouraged, and produced by the Players. This season proved that Cook was right—given a chance, the American playwright could write worthwhile drama. Paradoxically, this season also marked the downfall of the Provincetown as an experimental, amateur theatre. After these plays, no critic or producer could ignore the tiny theatre, and plays began to move uptown after their two-week runs at

[7] Quoted by Floyd Dell in "A Seer in Iowa," included in *Greek Coins* (New York, 1925), p. 16.

[8] For a complete list of the plays and playwrights produced by the Provincetown, see Stella Hanau and Helen Deutsch, *The Provincetown: A Story of the Theatre* (New York, 1931).

the Provincetown were over. Cook could not accept this commercialization, nor the idea of turning professional. He insisted that the playwright had the best chance to develop in a small out-of-the-way place where the temptation to commercialize would be held to a minimum. Once his views were overruled, the Provincetown as it had been originally conceived was dead.

Cook left the Provincetown in 1922. He had seen his amateur theatre grow into a power and legend far beyond its size or intention. He had worked longer, more fiercely for his ideal than anyone, knowing that fame would destroy the idealism which sustained the theatre. For him the Provincetown's success was its failure. He wrote: "Since we have failed spiritually in the elemental things—failed to pull together—failed to do what any football or baseball team or crew do as a matter of course with no word said—and since the result of this is mediocrity, we keep our promise: We give this theatre we love good death; the Provincetown Players end their story here."[9]

He realized that postwar America had no use for his beliefs; he was an idealist in a practical age, a mystic in a scientific world. He could only retreat—to the past, to an earlier dream, to Greece. Cook's departure for Greece was inevitable. All his life he had been trying to create in America the Hellenic spirit and the pioneer virtues. He had left his birthplace because it refused to carry on the meaning of its ancestry; he had failed to keep alive the renascent spirit of the Provincetown. Only Greece was left. Cook hoped to find there a culture untouched by commercialism, resembling the life of antiquity, patterned after the meaning that could be found in the classical ruins. His idealism and personality were strong enough that whatever he discovered in Greece in 1922 he was able to transform into a life closer to what he thought it should have been.

Even in exile, however, Cook kept his faith in the American past. He sensed a kinship between the Greek peasant and the American pioneer, so that his exile was not a rejection of his heritage, but a peculiar way of complementing it. Living with these "golden" peasants and re-educating them in their traditions, Cook reaffirmed his debt to his own heritage. For the short time he lived there, he was happy wearing Greek clothes, examining the classical ruins, and reviving the traditions the modern Greek had lost. He spoke "old" rather than modern Greek, planned a revival of the classical Greek theatre, and translated several forgotten Greek poets.

He gave to Greece as much as he took from her. Unlike the typical tourist who rushes through a foreign land, camera in hand, finding only what he expects, Cook reminded the Greeks of their heritage by living his life as he felt they should be living theirs. He showed them the meaning of the shepherd's life in the mountains and the citizen's life in the city. Dancing barefoot on the earthen floor of the temples, rebuilding a wall of Cyclopean rock, Cook taught the Greeks the pattern of their lives ac-

[9] Quoted in *Road to the Temple*, p. 310. A few pages earlier in her book, Miss Glaspell gives Cook's reasons for not wanting to move uptown or allow the better plays to become Broadway productions: "Fills atmosphere of P. P. with up-town point of view of money and notoriety. Prevents our giving an equal chance to the unknown or little-known playwright, whose need is greater. We exist to cause the writing of the best plays that can be written in the United States, and to give each play the best possible start in life. This includes *inspiring* playwrights. If in any way we decrease the force of desire to write true plays, we defeat the purpose for which we exist" (p. 305).

cording to ancient rituals. He died in Delphi on January 14, 1924, too soon to have accomplished much; but there is a Greek National Theatre now largely because of his efforts, and stories about "Kyrios" Cook are still told over the Greek radio. Next to Byron he is the most beloved of Greek foreign heroes. His grave is marked by a stone from the Parthenon which was granted Cook by a grateful Greek government for reminding them of the meaning of the past.

Cook felt that his life was a failure. In a poem he wrote for his daughter Nilla, he summed up his life:

> Why shouldn't I save you the mistakes
> which wasted my abundant life?
> Well, there's no chance.
> But that is why I have a bad conscience
> about you—
> Because I have so much—
> And just failed—barely—
> That I owe you
> The chance not to start over again
> in the dark
> As I started,
> But with my light.
> I have not given you my light,
> And I have been a light-bringer
> To those around me
> Because light is born in me,
> And is there as a gift to be given
> And I have not given it to you,
> And my life seems to me wasted
> Because I have not.[10]

The failure of Cook's life was that he could never accept the practical results of his idealism—he wanted to eat his cake and have it too. He wanted a modern America based on the past, but he could not envision this in the middle-class temper of his day, which he considered a force destructive to his ideals. He was forced, therefore, to flee; first to Chicago, then New York, finally Greece, where he was most content because the modern world was far away and the past was tangible in the language and lives surrounding him. He couldn't accept success as an inevitable part of his vision. He failed to see that the years of the Provincetown were a necessary preparation for the new drama coming alive both on and off Broadway; that for the Provincetown to become professional was proof of its success, not its failure.

Coming back to the contemporary reader's question "What did Cook do that is important?" we can answer in two ways. He is important, first of all, because he had the vision, the ability to begin and sustain the Provincetown Theatre—the first theatre to produce American playwrights of serious intent. Secondly, Cook represents a spirit, rare in our time, of old-fashioned idealism. For all his modernity, he was closer to the romantic temperament of Emerson and Whitman than to the realistic mood of our day. We live in an age governed by forces which Cook detested: the middle class, commercialism, and group conformity. He reminds us by his life of other values which we have neglected: pioneer self-reliance, humanitarianism, a unified culture like that of ancient Greece, and of the possibilities of an artistic flowering rising from these values. These are the ideals he lived by. His life was directed by a profound love of his country and an awareness of her needs. If he failed, and perhaps he did, this does not necessarily mean that he was wrong.

[10] *Greek Coins*, pp. 113-114.

TYPES OF INDONESIAN PROFESSIONAL THEATRE

James R. Brandon

PROFESSIONAL theatre in Indonesia today is almost entirely traditional theatre. On the island of Java, where most of the country's dramatic activity is concentrated (and where fifty million people of the archipelago live), there are several dozen professional theatres. All of them do one form of traditional theatre or another: *wayang orang, ketoprak, sandiwara, ludruk,* or other less important forms. The purpose of this article is to describe briefly these Indonesian theatre forms.

In general, each form has evolved in the attempt to dramatize a particular period of Indonesian civilization (though there is some overlapping among them): *wayang orang* dramatizes the semi-religious myths of Indonesian pre-history; *ketoprak,* the early Hindu-Javanese period and the time of Islamic conversion; *sandiwara,* the era of Dutch rule when Indonesia was the Dutch East Indies (and other periods as well); and *ludruk,* contemporary times.

Of these, the oldest is the *wayang orang,* or "human puppet" theatre, so called because its plays are adaptations for the stage of shadow and puppet plays. At the time *wayang orang* was created in the eighteenth century, these plays had already been popular on the puppet stages for many centuries.[1] At first *wayang orang* was just a pastime for the Javanese aristocracy; it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that performances were given in public theatres.[2] Today it is the most popular form of live theatre in the country, and it closely rivals the well-beloved puppet theatres for the favors of the Indonesian audience. At its best *wayang orang* is a dazzling theatre that delights the uninitiated foreigner as much as the Indonesian devotee. It is a highly refined and, in many ways, a unique theatre.

Wayang orang draws its dramatic impulse from Indonesian versions of the great Hindu epics, the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata.* These were first translated into Javanese from the original Sanskrit a thousand years ago. Over the centuries they have become thoroughly assimilated into Indonesian culture; the average spectator at a *wayang* play is quite unaware that the incidents and the characters on the stage before him are of Indian origin. To all but the sophisticated, Rama and Ardjuna are well loved Indonesian princes who, at one time in the misty past, lived among the palm trees and rice fields of Java. The epics are now so completely Indonesian that they are referred to as Indonesia's "classical literature."

Mr. Brandon (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1955), a member of the Foreign Service, spent 1955-1957 in Indonesia and is now language officer at the American Embassy in Tokyo.

[1] So old are the shadow puppets (*wayang kuliet*) and the stick puppets (*wayang golek*), and so shrouded in myths are their origins, that it is difficult to say just when they began. Thus Faubion Bowers errs in stating that the stick puppet theatre is an outgrowth of the *wayang orang* live theatre and that the stick puppets therefore "imitate human beings imitating the shadow puppets" (*Theatre in the East* [New York, 1956], p. 219). At the very least we know that both puppet theatres were in advanced stages of development long before the Islamic tide of the 15th century swept over the islands.

[2] H. M. De Vries, *The Importance of Java* (Batavia, 1929), p. 60.

With certain minor exceptions, *wayang orang* has not looked beyond these colorful, conflict-filled epics for story materials. It hasn't been necessary, for they are enormously long (the original *Mahabharata* is 220,000 words),[3] and over the years they have become even longer as incidents of purely Indonesian invention have been added. It is from this vast reservoir that characters and plot incidents are drawn to make up the hundreds of plays in the *wayang orang* repertory.

Because of this background *wayang orang* has developed into a highly formalized type of drama. The physical appearance and emotional makeup of each character are firmly established by long tradition. Costume and makeup are so exactly prescribed that most characters are recognizable on sight. There are accepted ways of doing certain scenes.

In fact the same kinds of scenes occur in every play, and they occur in a more or less definite order: first the leading characters enter one by one and introduce themselves by means of solo dances; then, in a stately audience before the king (or god), the opposing forces of good and evil set forth the dispute of the play, and, with heroic gestures, challenge each other to combat. The last part of every play consists of a rapid succession of chase scenes and dance-combats in which the refined good nobles defeat the uncouth evil ones. (True to Indonesian ethics refinement always conquers brute force.) In between there will be romantic interludes, for love is often the field of contest (as is the entire *Ramayana*) and there will be comedy scenes.

Because the audience is familiar with the general outlines of the story, and often the details as well, plot tends to be little more than an interesting framework on which to hang the standard components of *wayang orang:* dance, music, song, romance, humor, and individual combat. It is in the sensual appeal of these elements, not in plot or character development, that the attraction of *wayang orang* lies.

It will be noted, however, that it is only because elements of plays are interchangeable (I have seen the same scene three times at one theatre, each time as a logical part of a different play) and because actors repeat the same roles, that *wayang orang* troupes can do a different play every night and still maintain high artistic standards. Actors are so familiar with their roles that plays are entirely ad libbed. It would be difficult to conceive of a system of theatrical production more unlike our own than this.

What then does one actually see and hear at a *wayang orang* performance? First of all one hears the rippling music of the Indonesian *gamelan* orchestra. A dozen or more musicians draw rich, warm tones from tuned sets of burnished brass bars, gongs, and bowls by striking them with padded mallets. Counter melodies from the different instruments weave in and around each other in complex rhythmic patterns. Drums, a flute, and a kind of violin called a *rebab* add color to the music (the only truly polyphonic music native to Asia).[4] From time to time one or two female singers, sitting with the musicians in the orchestra pit, sing in the reedy, penetrating style peculiar to Indonesian vocal music. Sitting with them is a *dalang,* a holdover from the puppet

[3] H. S. Banner, *Romantic Java* (London, 1927), p. 87.

[4] The sound of the Javanese (or Sundanese) *gamelan* used in *wayang orang* is subdued, even austere, when compared to the brilliant sound of the Balinese *gamelan* (heard in America as accompaniment to the "Dancers of Bali' performances).

theatre, who narrates certain passages of the play.

After a short musical introduction, the curtain rises and the major characters in the drama make their appearance, each performing a solo dance appropriate to his character. First on stage are the good nobles, lithe, slim, moving with supple elegance. Their strength is the strength of repose. Each is dressed in brocade silk trousers and a bold patterned *batik* print waistcloth from which two silk scarves drape to the floor. A golden headdress, wristlets, and six-inch ear-dangles of flashing jewels complete the costume. The rest of the body is bare. While not elaborate, the costume is striking in appearance.

Next to enter are the ritual antagonists of *wayang orang*—a group of evil giants. In Indonesian eyes they present the ultimate in coarseness. They are fat and have great mats of black hair on their chests. Their makeup emphasizes bulging eyes, red faces, beards, and even fangs, grotesqueries that are associated with evil through long custom. Their blustering demeanor and their extravagant dance movements draw the ridiculing laughter of the audience.

Then the women of the court enter, tightly sheathed in brown and white *batik* skirts and black velvet bodices that leave the arms and shoulders bare. Their loose hair falls straight to the hips, topped by headdresses of a soft gold color. So effortlessly, so leisurely do they move that their dance seems to be in slow motion. With sinuous arm and finger movements they flick the vivid scarves hanging from their waists. Their dance is decorous, restrained, stylized.

Last of the major characters to appear are the traditional clowns of the Indonesian stage: Semar and his two foolish sons Petruk and Gareng. Semar is fat, slow-witted, and the butt of most jokes. Petruk is sly; he delights in perpetrating tricks on the nobility. Gareng is a scatterbrain. The clowns, who are always servants in the play, are a purely Indonesian addition to the *wayang* cast of characters; one will look in vain for them in the original epics. Outwardly bumbling and stupid, they are in reality endowed with special godly powers. They are the spokesmen for the common man in what are otherwise thoroughly aristocratic plays. Needless to say they are the audience's favorites.

Though the plays are supposedly set in mythological times, they are actually staged in the style of the Javanese court of the last century. The costume is court costume, the settings are Javanese palaces, and the etiquette is Javanese court etiquette, down to the last deferential gesture.

Perhaps to an American the most striking qualities of *wayang orang* are its elegance and restrained grace. These qualities, which count for little in our own society, were supreme virtues in the aristocratic society of old Java and are still highly regarded by Indonesians of all classes. It is interesting to note some of the special techniques which are used to convey these qualities on the stage.

In the first place all movement and gesture are formalized into dance patterns, thus reflecting directly the fastidious elegance of the Javanese court. Even when not moving, actors adopt dance positions which hold the body erect and poised. The hands are held in prescribed positions either at the hips, if standing, or on the knees, if sitting. (The fact that actors wear nothing on their feet contributes to their ability to exercise the extremely fine control over their movements which is characteristic of *wayang orang* dance.)

Makeup is used to enhance the actors'

visual appeal. Women and refined nobles darken the eyebrows, accent the eyes, and rouge the lips. Women pencil in elaborate curls of hair at the forehead and temples in the old court style. Both actors and actresses rub the exposed parts of the body with a thin coat of yellowish water-base body makeup. Under bright lights, the naturally smooth textured, brown colored skin of the actors takes on a luminous and velvet-like appearance which is extremely attractive.

And finally there is the impressive stage diction of *wayang orang*. Vowel sounds are lengthened; the cadence is slow and imposing. So strongly stylized is the actors' speech that it seems to border on chanting or even singing. When expressing strong emotion the voice rises sharply in pitch and intensity, but it is always restrained; it is never released in the booming eloquence common to our theatre. (As a consequence, in scenes of great stress dialogue is apt to sound unpleasantly strained to our ears, though of course to the Indonesian audience this is merely the conventional way of expressing controlled emotion.)

It is difficult to say just how many troupes there are performing *wayang orang* plays today. I know of at least a dozen in Java; there are undoubtedly more, particularly small troupes which tour from village to village. In West Java the plays are given in Sundanese; in the rest of Java the Javanese language is used.[5] There are several outstanding troupes.

Sriwedari, in the old court city of Surakarta, is considered by many to be the finest troupe of all. It was a Surakarta king, Paku Buwono II, who first created *wayang orang*; and it was in the Surakarta court that *wayang orang* developed into a refined art form. Productions at *Sriwedari* reflect this heritage. The acting, the dancing, and the music are of the highest quality. The staging is handsome. Alone among Indonesian theatres, *Sriwedari* has earned a secure place on the "standard tour" of the islands.

This is not to imply that *Sriwedari* is a dusty museum piece. Far from it. If anything, it is criticized for pandering to public taste. For example, because the women of Surakarta are reputed to be the most beautiful in the country, the women's roles at *Sriwedari* are emphasized. The parts of refined heroes are played by the company's most alluring young actresses, and each performance opens on a chorus of eighteen dancing girls, decorous to be sure, but a chorus with sex appeal nonetheless.

The clowns are not above ordering a hamburger and a beer apiece—over the telephone and in English. Perhaps it is the influence of the movies, but just before the final curtain falls at *Sriwedari*, a sign reading *Tamat*, "The End," is lowered in front of the final tableau. Scholars may complain, but the public comes back for more.

The other most important *wayang orang* troup in Central Java is *Ngesti Pandawa*. Originally from Surakarta, the troupe toured for several years before settling nine years ago in Semarang, a bustling commercial center about 80 miles from Surakarta.

Because there are no dancing choruses and the clowns are not permitted to use anachronisms as gags, because *Ngesti Pandawa* adheres closely to the

[5] There are also occasional live performances of the *Mahabharata* and *Ramayama* stories on the island of Bali. However, the style of this Balinese *wayang* is completely different from the *wayang* of Java, and the Balinese language is used. See Miguel Covarrubias, *Island of Bali* (New York, 1950), p. 244.

old *wayang orang* traditions, it is the favorite of purists.

In addition to doing daily performances, actors are required to rehearse twice weekly in order to become proficient in a variety of roles. (At most theatres actors are strongly typed and rehearsals are therefore seldom considered necessary.) There are even two sets of clowns so that these important actors will not go stale playing night after night.

Unlike most troupes *Ngesti Pandawa* has no star system. There are three acting ranks with different salary scales, but actors in all ranks play major and minor roles. As a result *Ngesti Pandawa* productions exhibit a degree of cohesiveness and coordination unusual in Indonesian theatre.

Such production devices as mood lighting, scrims, trapdoors, and the trick of turning one person into another with lights and mirrors are popular. In recent years it has become the company's trademark to include an imposing procession scene in every play. Favorites with the audience are those in which military forces are being marshalled for battle. An eight-foot high "elephant" (with rider), life-like battle steeds, squads of warriors, and arms-bearers march by to martial music played by the *gamelan* orchestra. Nowhere else on the Indonesian stage can productions on this scale be seen.

Langen Sedyo Rahajoe, one of the smaller *wayang orang* troupes, is considered the best in East Java. About seven years ago the troupe settled in its present home, Surabaya, Indonesia's second largest city. Most of the actors, like those at *Ngesti Pandawa,* originally came from Surakarta. In its very small somewhat rickety theatre the troupe does exuberant performances for standing-room-only houses each night of the week plus a matinee on Sunday.

In Sundanese-speaking West Java there are no special *wayang orang* troupes.[6] Instead, *wayang* stories are performed by *sandiwara* troupes. *Sandiwara* is the generic term for drama in Indonesian. In keeping with the broad meaning of the word, plays of various kinds are performed.

One of the best known *sandiwara* companies is *Sri Murni,* which plays in the pleasant mountain city of Bandung, once in the news as the site of the Asia-Africa Conference. Several nights each week *wayang* plays are performed in much the same style as at *Sriwedari* or *Ngesti Pandawa,* except on a reduced scale. The productions are less elaborate, the costumes are not so lavish, and the dancing is less refined (though to the Sundanese partisan the greater virility of the Sundanese dance style more than compensates for this).

The theatre in which *Sri Murni* plays is small and ill-equipped when compared to either *Sriwedari* or *Ngesti Pandawa.* In spite of this, or perhaps because of it, performances are highly professional. There is no card-playing or gossiping backstage as at some theatres. Even with infants and toddlers in the already crowded wings there is no commotion. Actors intently follow the progress of the play and once on stage perform earnestly. And last but not least, the clowns at *Sri Murni* are superbly funny.

[6] There are different terms for *wayang* in the three major Indonesian languages. *Wayang orang* is an Indonesian term and is heard today throughout the country. The Javanese term, *wayang wong,* is frequently encountered in pre-war books on *wayang* and is still commonly used in the Javanese speaking areas of Java and in Bali. Both *wayang orang* and *wayang wong* literally mean "human puppet." In West Java the Sundanese term *tjerita golek* (puppet story) is used. All are synonymous.

A later development stemming from *wayang orang* are plays of Indonesian history which are produced in *wayang* style. It is particularly common to see plays set in the Modjopahit period of the fourteenth century done this way.[7] Both *wayang orang* and *sandiwara* troupes do them. When done by the former they are called *langedrijan* (women customarily play all the roles);[8] when done by the latter they are called *tjerita sedjara* or "history stories." In all outward aspects they are so similar to true *wayang* plays that it is easy for a foreigner to confuse the two.

The other most important types of traditional Indonesian theatre are *ketoprak, ludruk,* and *sandiwara.* Though distinct from *wayang orang* in style and play content, they all have borrowed much from the older form. The *gamelan* is retained, as are the clowns, though often in modified form. The one-night run, the ad libbed acting, the troupe system, have all been taken over.

Ketoprak and *ludruk* troupes perform only in Javanese speaking Central and East Java. Many *ketoprak* plays are based on Arabic stories brought to Indonesia centuries ago by Arab traders. They are swashbuckling melodramas along the lines of "The Thousand and One Nights." Magic spells, prophecies, and charmed animals and birds figure in the plots. Dressed in turbans and flowing gowns and using the sweeping *salaam* of the Arabs, the actors present an exotic sight in tropical Java. It is not surprising that *ketoprak* is popular with the common people of the countryside, for it offers them a romantic picture of their religion's homeland, a place that they can never hope to see themselves no matter how much they may aspire to.

Ludruk, a type of light romantic comedy in which men play all the parts, is often seen in East Java, especially around Surabaya.[9] The problems of ordinary family life provide the slim plots on which the plays are based. There are dances, popular songs, and domestic humor, all designed to please an audience that comes for light entertainment.

In cities where *ketoprak* or *ludruk* is in competition with *wayang orang,* it suffers from the comparison. They haven't its honored connection with Indonesian classical literature, nor can they match the more elaborate staging of *wayang orang.* Each has its appeal for the Indonesian audience, but for the average visitor, *wayang orang,* with its spectacle, music, and dancing, is undoubtedly more attractive.

The West Java *sandiwara* troupes are all-purpose troupes doing *wayang orang, ketoprak,* and *ludruk* plays as well as other types. Some of the last might be called modern domestic plays. Some are good old-fashioned ghost stories (Sundanese ghosts, by the way, do not glide —they hop about like rabbits). Some deal with later periods of Indonesian history in a relatively realistic style.

On occasion the eclectic nature of *sandiwara* even includes western drama. Once in 1957 I attended a performance of the small *Sri Asih sandiwara* troupe in the provincial town of Sukabumi. The play, billed as "Damar Wulan," was supposedly about a hero of the Modjopahit period of 600 years ago. But what I saw was something very much like "Comedy of Errors." Two magi-

[7] William Fisher, "A Javanese Play," *Theatre Arts Monthly,* XXIV (April 1940), pp. 271-6.

[8] Harsono Hadisoeseno, "Wayang and Education," *Education and Culture,* No. 8, (Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, October 1955), p. 13.

[9] The fact that President Soekarno is an avid fan has helped *ludruk* become more acceptable to the educated classes.

cally endowed servants turned themselves into twins of their king and prime minister. The play followed the adventures and misadventures of the two as first they were mistaken for the real rulers and then as they met them face to face. The situations were strikingly like those used by Shakespeare.

The largest *sandiwara* troupe in the country and one of the most unusual is *Miss Tjitjih* (*Tjitjih* was the name of the company's first leading lady; the English "Miss" is for prestige). Because it is located in Djakarta, the country's capital and largest city, the theatre has been strongly affected by western influences all through its 45-year history. As Mr. Tarmedi, the company manager, put it, "We either keep up to date or our audience will go to the movies." So *Miss Tjitjih* straddles the fence. There is rock-and-roll music before, and *gamelan* music during performances; the clowns smoke cigarettes in *wayang* plays and think nothing of dressing in native *sarongs*, broadly striped polo shirts, and fezes or alpine hats. I remember one night I took a flash picture during a *wayang* play. In an instant one of the clowns knelt down reporter style, and mimicked my actions by snapping away with his cigarette lighter as if it were a camera. The audience roared its approval.

Certainly the most remarkable play to be seen on the boards in Indonesia today is *Miss Tjitjih's* "Hamlet." About two years ago the management decided that "Hamlet," with its murders, ghosts, and madness, might be just the play for its big city audience of clerks, *bechak* (trishaw) drivers, and laborers. Because no one in the troupe reads English and because there is no Indonesian translation of "Hamlet," the production was based on a scenario which the company playwright wrote after seeing the Laurence Olivier movie. Special western costumes and props were purchased, the main scenes were rehearsed, and in 1955 the play was premiered—ad libbed, of course. It immediately became one of the two most popular plays in *Miss Tjitjih's* repertory and is regularly revived several times each year.

Naturally it isn't quite the "Hamlet" we know. *Gamelan* music accompanies Ophelia's mad scene, a Moslem palace surrounded by drooping palm fronds serves as Elsinor, the ubiquitous clowns interrupt the ghost scene for fifteen minutes with one of their favorite routines, and the soliloquies get lost in the shuffle. Nevertheless it is a full-blooded, exciting "Hamlet." In terms of Indonesian theatre it comes off very well indeed. I wouldn't have missed the performance I saw for anything.

We can see that the professional stage in Indonesia is host to a variety of plays —classical plays, melodramas, domestic comedies, and western importations— all, however, produced within the framework of traditional theatre.

There is no western professional theatre as such. For a few years during and after the war a western theatre movement flourished, as the best writing, acting, and directing talent in the country devoted their energies to experiments in western drama.[10] But today the famous names have moved on to more secure jobs with the newspapers and the movies, and the movement is no more. All that remains are occasional unskilled productions by amateur groups in the large cities, as often as not more motivated by political than by artistic aspirations.

There is a newly formed Indonesian National Theatre Academy in Djakarta, dedicated to the development of a new Indonesian drama based on the esthetic of western drama. About thirty students

[10] Bowers, p. 220.

are currently enrolled. The Academy is staffed by highly qualified people, and recently received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation with which to buy books and equipment, but it lacks operating funds and faces the massive apathy of an Indonesian public long accustomed to other forms of theatre. After only two years of activity and one public performance it is too early to predict the outcome of its efforts. However, considering the present temper of the Indonesian public any marked increase in interest in western drama seems highly unlikely. (Actually, American, British, and Dutch little theatre groups are the only ones who regularly produce western style theatre, and this is not professional, nor is it Indonesian, theatre.)

And so, at a time when Indonesians are impatiently discarding many of their ancient traditions, they continue to hold fast to their own forms of drama. In towns and villages throughout the country, professional troupes do the old familiar plays, in the old familiar ways. Innovations there are, of course, but not in matters of substance, only in detail. This is in spite of the sweeping political and social changes which have occurred in Indonesia in recent years.

Today, the word "theatre" in Indonesia still means traditional theatre, as it has for centuries. Certainly traditional drama will retain its popularity for many years to come and audiences will continue to patronize *wayang orang*, *ketoprak*, *sandiwara* and *ludruk*.

* * *

DISCUSSION CONTESTS VERSUS GROUP-ACTION TOURNAMENTS

Wayne E. Brockriede and Kim Giffin

THE author of a recent article on the place of group discussion contests in extra-curricular forensics ventures the opinion that "the general level of competitive intercollegiate discussion will perceptibly improve, or the activity will lose its place in the present tournament picture."[1] After criticizing discussion contests vigorously, the writers of a second article observe that "improving the discussion contest at the college level is difficult, but perhaps possible."[2] Still another concludes that group discussion "*does* have a place in competitive forensic activities" and that improved judging "should eliminate most of the current objections to group discussion as a contest event."[3]

Before re-examining the role of group discussion in extra-curricular forensics, we would assume widespread agreement that discussion as an academic study is here to stay and that its importance is increasing. We would further assume that extra-curricular forensics is an appropriate program in which to offer training in group discussion. Otherwise we may be doing our students a serious disservice by exposing them to training in processes of advocacy without the necessary complementary training in discussion processes. As Lester Thonssen properly observed nearly twenty years ago, "Discussion and debate are two aspects of one process."[4] Our students, consequently, need to see relationships between the two activities which combine to form the democratic deliberative process, and they may be unable to do so without training in both activities.

The thesis of this article is: (1) that the discussion contest, the extra-curricular instrument most often currently used to train students in group discussion, is unable to provide good discussion training, and (2) that better training methods and formats could be designed for our extra-curricular forensics programs.

1.

May we not reasonably expect that good training in group discussion would include the development of understanding and skills in the basic elements of the group discussion situation? We would define these basic characteristics as Dean Barnlund has done:

> First, there must be a group; that is to say, there must be a plural number of persons in dynamic interaction with each other. . . . Second, the interaction must be predominantly on a verbal basis; that is to say, changes in attitude or behavior on the part of group members must be brought about chiefly through speech.[5]

Discussion contests are plagued with two weaknesses which doom to failure

Mr. Brockriede (Ph.D., Illinois, 1954) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Supervisor of Forensics at the University of Illinois. Mr. Giffin (Ph.D., Iowa, 1950), Head of the Speech Division and Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Kansas, is Past-Editor of CSSJ.

[1] Grace Walsh, "Tournaments: for Better or Worse?" *The Speech Teacher*, VI (1957), 67.

[2] David W. Shepard and Forrest L. Seal, "The Discussion Contest: Requiescat in Pace," *Ibid.*, p. 223.

[3] Robert S. Cathcart, "The Case of Group Discussion Contests," *Ibid.*, pp. 317-18.

[4] "The Social Value of Discussion and Debate," *QJS*, XXV (1939), 114-5.

[5] "Our Concept of Discussion: Static or Dynamic?" *The Speech Teacher*, III (1954), 9.

any attempt to train students to understand group relationships in discussion situations. First of all, to state the matter simply, discussion *groups* are not established. Even when real groups are neither very primary nor very cohesive, there is somewhere a bond, a reason for being, a force to unite individuals into a group relationship. Perhaps it is friendship for other members of the group, perhaps loyalty toward a parent body, perhaps a common danger or enemy, perhaps a shared stake in a decision to be made, a question to be studied, or a task to be completed.

In the contest, however, these bonds are not present. Typically, six to ten students from each of six to ten schools are assigned to meet in the same room. These students share few if any friendships, common experiences, or organizational allegiances. The often broad discussion question which is selected by the faculty may be of some interest to some students, but the question did not bring the group together. Rather, discussants are present by the accident of contest entry and the coincidence of random assignment.

Nor do they become unified once in the group. Although discussion contests make use of deliberative questions, which in a real group would serve a unifying function, in the typical contest there is no decision to make, no action to take, no recommendations to formulate, no task to perform. In short, discussants enter, participate, and depart as individuals, not as group members, and the contest "group" seems to support F. H. Allport's definition of a group as what you have when all the members leave.

The judging factor, inherent in the discussion contest, distorts in a second way the relationship between members of the group. When students are highly competitive—particularly when the discussion contest is staged, as it usually is, as part of a debate tournament—interpersonal relations become strange indeed. The discussant sees cooperativeness as important in the discussion process. This conception combines with the presence of the judge and the competitiveness of the student to call forth an insincere competition in cooperativeness toward agreement. Robert Scott reports that a debater has commented that the secret of discussion is to get the floor first and then no one can disagree with you.[6]

It is not the student's competitive attitude itself, however, which is harmful. We recognize that real groups may well include members in competition with other members. What we deplore is the basic individualistic orientation of the discussant in the discussion contest. In real groups, if members compete with other members, they do so as group members working toward the achievement of some group product, not as individuals competing for high individual ratings.

Even among students who are not markedly competitive there is an almost inevitable tendency in discussion contests toward individualized orientation. With no real group toward which to focus membership and with no specific task or decision upon which to concentrate attention, the discussant not unnaturally becomes concerned with a judge's rating and permits such a rating to motivate his discussion behavior.

The judging function, therefore, further distorts the relations among members of the contest "group" (a fiction which is itself a distortion). The pseudo-discussion which results is harmful enough to students to negate whatever

[6] "A Philosophy of Discussion," *Southern Speech Journal*, XIX (1954), 244.

educational advantages might accrue from the contest. The contest confuses those students who may have had good courses in discussion and may consequently see discrepancies between discussion theory and discussion as practiced in the contest. Our students whose only educational experience with discussion occurs in the contest must unfortunately regard discussion as a role-playing situation in which most of the members play the same role, the individualist who manages a superficial and insincere caricature of agreeableness. Many students develop extremely negative attitudes not only toward discussion contests, but toward the very process of discussion itself. After taking part in discussion contests, some students not only have resisted further competition, but also have rejected invitations to participate in real group or public discussion.

Discussion contests, then, fail to train students in understanding group relationships in discussion. Let us now see whether such contests adequately develop skills of oral deliberation in group situations.

One of the skills we would hope to develop is the use of information in deliberative discussion. The prime weakness of contest discussion here is that discussants are not motivated to find information to use. Contest discussants are almost invariably uninformed beyond newspaper headlines, bull sessions, and an occasional article. We have heard discussants so impressed with the single articles they had consulted that each contribution was prefaced with pride by, "My article says. . . ."

Not only is the information in contest discussion scarce, but seldom is the rare piece of factual data analyzed or probed either by the contributor or by others present. Perhaps its rarity gives the bit of information a sort of halo effect which militates against its close scrutiny. The result is a failure of the members of the group to pool a basic grasp of the question under discussion.

Sometimes criticism of such deficiency is dismissed with the advice that faculty members should encourage their students to prepare more thoroughly for contest discussions. The practicability of such advice is questionable, since the demand for thorough preparation is visualized by students and faculty members alike much more clearly in debate than in discussion. Consequently as long as debate and discussion events occur in the same tournaments, discussion preparation will probably continue to suffer.

Another skill in oral deliberation we would hope to develop is the ability to formulate and use an organizational pattern. Because of the prominence of "the discussion outline," contest discussion might appear to provide effective training in discussion pattern if in no other way.

That it does not is clear from observations of contest discussion groups. Part of the failure is shared in the classroom. Discussion pedagogy generally fails to understand that Dewey's pattern of reflective thinking is just one potentially useful pattern, not the necessary liturgy of any deliberative discussion group, and discussion teachers generally have failed to develop training methods for effective teaching of pattern in discussion.

But part of the failure is peculiar to contest discussion. When discussion is one tournament event, its scheduled time must be limited. Primarily because of time limitations, we deprive our students of training in formulating a pattern of analysis by giving all the groups the same discussion outline. Given an

outline which characteristically contains several different kinds of analyses, given a topic which is ordinarily quite broad in scope, and given a time limit of one, two, or three hours, the result is inevitable: a generalized and mechanical hurry through the ritual of the discussion outline.

Some of the decisive weaknesses in contest discussion, then, are (1) that genuine groups are not established, (2) that competitive individual ratings distort relationships among discussants, (3) that students and faculty members are not sufficiently motivated to effect thorough preparation for contest discussion, and (4) that sufficient time is not provided for the event.

2.

As a possible form of competitive group discussion which meets the criticisms summarized above, the Group-Action approach is here offered for consideration. Actually, this approach is not new but is an adaptation of established committee discussion practices.

The Group-Action approach utilizes the motivational force of competition. Our experience with debate and public speaking contests convinces us that competition in any forensic activity is necessary. However, the Group-Action approach secures that competition between group-action teams rather than between individual members of discussion groups.

In order to provide a realistic discussion situation, a general topic is selected which is fairly close to student life: e.g., "What should be the criteria for choosing a vocation?" or "What should college students do to meet the problems of increased enrollment?" The general topic is sent out to participating schools weeks in advance of the tournament. On the day of the tournament a more specific topic, which had been included as a subtopic under the previously released general topic, is selected by the director of the tournament for discussion by all the competing teams.

Each committee or team consists of a minimum of four and maximum of six students from the same school. Each team is directed to meet by itself *with its faculty advisor* (coach) to discuss the topic. Where they meet and the procedures by which they find the best or most defensible solution to the problem are left entirely to the members of the team and to their faculty advisor.

The faculty advisor during the tournament is a consultant for his team. He may evaluate the procedures employed by the members of his group and give them a critique after the tournament if he so desires, thereby teaching some of the techniques of the discussion *process*. It is presumed, however, that he will have done much of his instructional work months or weeks before the tournament and that during the tournament he will be a procedural consultant.

The teams have the entire day and as much of the night as they wish to use to prepare committee reports. The reports are due at 8:00 a.m. on the second day of the tournament. All committee reports must be typewritten and signed by the entire team (with the exception of the faculty advisor). Dissenting team members may give their dissenting opinions as a part of the written report, or, if warranted, a minority report can be prepared. The organizational pattern and written style of the report are left entirely to the members of the Group-Action Team.

During the morning of the second day a selected panel of qualified judges evaluates the written committee reports. Their criteria are as follows:

(1) Analysis—definition of the problem, its scope, extent, and causes.
(2) Logical argument or reasoning—the cogency of reasons (arguments) presented in support of the solution selected by the committee.
(3) Factual information or evidence—the amount and relevancy of factual data presented to defend the team's analysis of the problem and to support the arguments favoring the solution selected.
(4) Organization—the appropriate ordering of ideas to produce a committee report which has unity, coherence, and emphasis.
(5) Language—the selection of appropriate words to express clearly, concisely, and correctly the ideas of the committee.

During the afternoon of the second day the panel of judges meets with each of the committees, one at a time, in private sessions. Each member of the team must be prepared to defend orally the product of the committee. Dissenting opinions and minority reports should be defended by dissenters, and the majority position should be defended by majority members of the committee. The oral defense session should be limited to answers to questions posed by the judges, who may interrupt any committee member at any time. All committee members need not speak in defense of the report, but each individual member should be prepared to answer questions which are directed to him by one or another of the judges.

The criteria for judgment listed above should continue to apply during the oral defense of the committee reports. Although delivery and speaking ability will obviously play a part in making favorable or unfavorable impressions on the judges, the judges should not evaluate delivery *per se*. They should view it as a vehicle by which the committee members show that they have properly analyzed the problem and have reasons and facts to support the solution which they have selected. The object of the judges is to pick that committee which in their estimation has produced the best *product* of discussion.

The Group-Action approach is realistic because committees in real life have to defend their positions to the members of organizations of which they are a part or to the general public. Those who hear such defenses are usually fairly well informed on the problems and vitally interested in their resolution. The judges, therefore, should be selected on the basis of their knowledge of the topic and their interest in the area. For example, if the topic were "Problems in American Education," a panel of three noted educators might be selected as judges.

The Group-Action approach to competitive discussion assumes that the real significance of discussion method lies in what that method *produces*. It stresses the development of a solution to the problem, supported by factual information. Obviously, the *process* used to produce such a report is important, and the faculty advisor can evaluate process during and after the tournament. But the *product* is of primary significance if we are to approach the establishment of realistic discussion situations.

The Group-Action approach places competition where it belongs—between groups rather than between individuals. It allows students from each school to continue to act as an homogeneous group. Team spirit is present; cooperation among the members of a team is fostered because they succeed as a team, not as individuals.

Judgment of individual performance is left entirely to the individual participant's faculty advisor. The student is interested in the suggestions offered by the faculty advisor because both are interested in one objective—the end-product produced by the team. Each faculty director is vitally interested in

the performance of each member of the team. He will be anxious to see that they cooperate with each other, that they properly evaluate ideas, and that each individual member has an opportunity to bring to the group any idea or bit of information which has logical value and relevancy.

During the spring of 1958 a pilot study of such a tournament was conducted within the framework of Speech 66, a course in discussion at the University of Kansas. Outside judges were selected, the class was divided into teams, and staff members were assigned to act the part of faculty advisors or coaches. The purpose of this pilot study was not to evaluate procedure but to develop more clearly our concept of such a tournament and to produce tentative reactions from staff members and students in advance of setting up an intercollegiate Group-Action tournament.

During the academic year of 1958-1959 the University of Kansas will institute such a tournament on a limited experimental basis. Subsequently an attempt will be made to determine the academic values achieved by the participants, through a research project under the direction of Brad Lashbrook, who will question and interview students, faculty directors, and judges to determine as nearly as possible the extent to which desirable results accrue.

We recommend the Group-Action tournament as the kind of extra-curricular discussion event with which directors of forensics should experiment. We firmly believe we should replace discussion contests with interesting and competitive situations in which students are trained to work together in genuine groups with maximum productivity as a motivated goal.

* * *

THE FORUM

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

To the Editor:

Thomas R. Nilsen's article, "Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process," in the October 1958 issue of *QJS* is valuable for its clear and forthright statement of a major and perhaps terrifying issue confronting our democracy. When PR men package and merchandise political candidates only for the Republican party, and in such a manner as to by-pass thought, we must indeed be concerned.

But at the risk of being labelled a cynic, I suggest that a realistic appraisal of the situation must lead, at best, to a "calculated risk." How many teachers who have given serious thought to the matter have not been aware of the "risk" that our collective influence as teachers is, or can be, far outweighed by the mass media of communication?

For us to denounce the use to which such mass media have been and are being put is not likely to result in much material change in either their use or the philosophy of the quick-sell pragmatists and politicians who use their services.

The ethical concepts, the honesty and integrity of a goodly minority of high-minded intellectuals living under the Weimar Republic, did not seem as much as to deflect Adolph Hitler's rise to power.

There are still debate coaches who minimize, and others who prohibit the use of, the pathetic appeal in its motivational form, just as there are still public speaking courses taught on a "will" and "intellect" philosophy. But, as Brigance pointed out elsewhere in *QJS* of October 1958, we recognize a more integrated methodology today; and as Froeschels reiterated, we cannot regard our sciences as anything but interdependent.

Modern motivational psychology and its use by public speakers in our democratic and non-democratic world have forced upon teachers of speech an awareness of its new persuasive values and adoption of them in classroom and textbook, just as belated awareness of Adolph Hitler's ethics and values forced Neville Chamberlain to resign, and the democratic powers, finally, in war, to use many dictatorial methods to defeat Hitler and his group.

The ethics of the student speaker are, in the main, part and parcel of him before we approach his training in college, or, in large part, even in high school. We certainly must encourage high standards and ideals, must vigorously point out that the speaker should attempt to persuade only to that in which he himself believes, and to that which he believes to be to the long-range benefit of the majority he attempts to reach. But when Walter Lippmann and Thomas Nilsen, in paraphrase, state that there "are rules of evidence and parliamentary procedure and codes of fair dealing and fair comment, by which the loyal man will consider himself bound when he exercises the right to publish opinions," they merely delimit the range of an already handicapped group.

The endearing use of their own propaganda device in the word "loyal" above will not one whit phase those preparing the way for Big Brother any more than

will the concept itself. All it may do is make the battle more unequal by causing a few to deny themselves the right to any expression which is not scrupulously documented and, perhaps, to any expression which is emotionally couched. "Should" and "ought to" did not stop the barbarians on the outskirts of Rome, nor will it stop the PR men.

But there are ever-increasing numbers attending college. Perhaps as listeners and readers they can be made aware of these devices and safeguarded against them. Perhaps as speakers and writers they can be helped to see the pragmatic value of and need for including evidence and logic along with motivational appeals because the most educated and influential elements of the community are, we hope, on the lookout for that "something more." Perhaps we may convince them that, before attempting persuasion, they must believe in what they say, and must believe that what they say will be of benefit to their audience in spite of the ethic of salesmanship and business confronting them.

Mr. Nilsen, in summation, stated: "The problem of ethics enters when what we do affects the lives of others. How we influence others to make choices about things of importance to them is obviously affecting their lives in a significant way. . . . *By constantly limiting the critical faculties in decision we are limiting the basis upon which it is possible to have a responsible citizenry, and thus we weaken the very foundations of democracy.*" (Italics mine.)

I think Mr. Nilsen is here using the all-inclusive "we" to aim at offenders who are not likely to be his readers and not, as a group, to be affected, the PR men. The admonition then becomes a futile preachment from one within a small group to others of that group, who are already convinced. We must know the situation and our culture as it stands, and try to acquaint those within our own groups with it, but above all, it seems to me, our most promising action is frank appraisal of the situation before the minds of our students.

RICHARD ROTHMAN
Central Michigan College

WHO IS TO BLAME?

To the Editor:

With "Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process" (*QJS*, October 1958) Thomas R. Nilsen joined the increasing ranks of writers alarmed at the methods of mass advertising. He describes those methods in relation to the political arena and contrasts them with his concept of the "values" of democratic society. He includes a pertinent warning, furthermore, that a democracy must be concerned with the method of persuasion, as well as with its end. To these words, it would seem, one can only say yea. Considering the tone and content of the entire article, however, there are two key questions which are handled in a disturbing fashion: (1) Who is to blame? and (2) What can be done about it?

It is Mr. Nilsen's implication that the advertising industry and the politician who employs that industry are to blame. His solution is expressed in a final exhortation that "Freedom of speech . . . imposes on everyone who exercises that right an obligation to use speech so that it becomes a carrier of freedom." I would submit that the first point includes but a part, and not necessarily the most significant part, of the story, and that the second point is indisputable but also somewhat vague for practical purposes.

Without ignoring the role of the political "advertiser," I would prefer, as a teacher, to examine the citizenry

which, on the one hand, is the alleged victim of "undemocratic" methods of persuasion and, on the other hand, makes such methods possible. Mr. Nilsen gives us some idea of that body when he mentions the indifferent voter and when he speaks of the non-rational responses of the human creature. This non-rational aspect he dismisses by recognizing it and then asking for increased use of rational faculties. But the "emotional" tendencies of man are of paramount importance in the whole problem. If persuasive (as opposed to argumentative) devices may be employed to secure belief or action, as Mr. Nilsen undoubtedly would agree, where, in practical terms, does one draw the line? This is not to deny that a line should be drawn, perhaps, but merely to suggest that if one followed Mr. Nilsen's reasoning without reservations, "emotional" appeals would be eliminated from forensic endeavor. If such appeals are "allowable," then one returns to the crux of an intricate problem—how many and what kinds. This is one facet of the current analyses of mass advertising, in my reading, that is rarely met head on. Professor Franklyn Haiman, in his exceedingly orderly discussion of democratic ethics (*QJS*, December 1958) presents this issue more clearly, but circumvents it by calling it dangerous "only when it becomes the chronic or predominant pattern of behavior" of an individual or group. Such a view may simplify the task of "moral condemnation" for the out-and-out emotionalist, into which category Mr. Haiman would place Billy Graham, but it is inadequate in evaluating the ethics of a politician such as Richard Nixon (to use another of Mr. Haiman's examples), who combines persuasion with argumentation by announcing his wife's Irish fighting spirit.

Since it appears that the citizen himself must assume a portion of the "blame" for undemocratic methods of persuasion, a more specific and tenable solution, or partial solution, suggests itself. One is tempted to echo the phrase "educating the public," but to put it in more realistic terms for the speech teacher, the situation seems to call for increased and continued emphasis in speech courses on the role of the audience: the implications and usefulness of the principles and techniques of speech for the student as listener. I am sure this is not a foreign concept in most speech courses at present, but if Mr. Nilsen's evaluation of current advertising-oriented forensics is accurate, then a rededication to that goal as a part of speech education would seem to be more meaningful than challenging the advertising industry to promote "the kind of speech that makes men free." Mr. Haiman reaches the same conclusion in his paper, noting that "the solution . . . lies not in attempting to outlaw the manipulator . . . but in teaching listeners." To balance his previous preoccupation with the manipulator, however, one might wish, again, for greater focus on the teacher and those who are manipulated.

BRUCE B. KLEE
Elmira College

AGAINST THE FILIBUSTER

To the Editor:

The following resolutions on proposed reforms in the rules of the U. S. Senate were adopted by the Interest Group on Parliamentary Procedure of SAA, at its business meeting at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago on December 28, 1958. The resolutions were transmitted to Vice-President Richard M. Nixon, the President Pro Tempore

of the Senate, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the Parliamentarian. They have since been read into the *Congressional Record* by Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois.

Whereas, the Parliamentary Procedure Interest Group of the Speech Association of America is greatly concerned with the processes of free discussion and action by majority will in legislative bodies, and

Whereas, under Rule XXII, the filibuster and the *threat* of filibuster in the United States Senate now interfere with free debate and may prevent consideration of and eventual action on proposals, and thus interfere with the democratic functioning of that legislative body, and

Whereas, there will be presented in the January session of the 80th Congress proposals for making cloture practically feasible in the Senate, and

Whereas, it is recognized that the Senate's rights as a fully deliberative body should in no way be infringed, and that any measures for cloture should be designed not to stifle discussion but rather to make possible bringing matters to a vote *eventually*, therefore

Resolved, That we endorse the statement of the President of the Senate (January 4, 1957) that:

> "It is the opinion of the Chair that . . . the right of a current majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to adopt its own rules, stemming as it does from the Constitution itself, cannot be restricted or limited by rules adopted by a majority of the Senate in a previous Congress."

And be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the principle of ending debate by two-thirds of those present and voting, a quorum being present, and be it further

Resolved, That after extensive debate, and due notice, a majority of Senators elected and sworn are sufficient to end debate, and be it further

Resolved, That motions to proceed to consideration of matters, or to change Standing Rules, should be subject to the same provisions of cloture, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, and to the President pro tempore.

WAYNE BROCKRIEDE, *Chairman*
CARL A. DALLINGER, *Secretary*

SPEECH IN THE U.S.S.R.

To the Editor:

In recent years the *QJS* has published a number of articles on the status of Speech as an academic discipline in foreign countries: Australia, France, Germany, Greece, and Japan. Robert T. Oliver has provided, in addition, a preliminary investigation of the content of speech courses overseas in his article "Speech Teaching Around the World" (*ST*, V, January, 1956). But to date there has been no specific information available on the teaching of speech in the Soviet Union.

Correspondence with Assistant Professor N. Timofeeva of the V. I. Lenin Pedagogical Institute in Moscow, the largest teachers college in the Soviet Union, has proved enlightening. She says, in part (and I am obliged to a colleague, Stanley Ziring, for the translation):

> As to the matter of philosophy of speech that we adopt for our future secondary school teachers, it must be said that we are not trying to prepare finished orators but rather teachers who are able to step forward and speak, having first mastered the principles of good Russian spoken usage.
>
> How is the improvement of oral discourse provided for in the curriculum? First of all, questions of theory and mastery of speaking in public are dealt with particularly in a course

devoted to contemporary Russian language, which is given by our historical and philological faculty over a period of three years. In the lectures included in this discipline the basic structure of Russian phonetics and phonemics and the pronunciation of sounds, sound-combinations and words are expounded in detail.

In connection with the course on contemporary Russian language, practical exercises are conducted in which the students are given practice in both oral and written composition.

A year before engaging in student teaching our students are required to take a special course which is called "Educational Development and the Mastery of Speech," and also to undertake practical exercises for this course in which they become proficient, through experience, in the processes of oral interpretation, ["expressive reading" in the original], narration, and actual public speaking. That is, they become acquainted with the foundations of the oratorical arts.

Our students in the four-year course work in special seminars which are devoted to developmental discourse in which are studied basic and special works concerning questions of the living word in accordance with the methods of improving speech communication.

Questions relating to the correction of speech disorders are taken up in the separate course entitled "Logopedia," and this is given in a separate department where we train special teachers for children having defects of the vocal apparatus or of hearing. This department is designated the Defectological Faculty.

It would seem, then, the speech education in the Soviet Union follows pretty much the same general pattern as in the United States: at least insofar as speech correction and audiology, basic speech and speech education are concerned.

The Lenin Pedagogical Institute would seem to provide a communications type of beginning course, in which both language and public speaking are taught. From Professor Timofeeva's letter we do not learn whether debate, discussion and parliamentary law are also taught.

A. L. McLeod
State University of New York, Fredonia

FOUR HERESIES IN THE TEACHING OF DRAMA

To the Editor:

William Hazlitt's remark that there "is no class of society whom so many persons regard with affection as actors" seems innocent enough. Unfortunately, the opportunity to see actors perform is limited throughout the hinterland; of the tens of thousands of students who enter colleges and universities for the first time each fall, only a small minority have actually watched, in performance, more plays than there are fingers on one hand.

Hence, an appreciation of good theatre will grow in the semi-darkness of a college playhouse, or in the classroom where plays are read and discussed. Eric Bentley has sought out, heroically, all evidences of interest in drama. Such interest will grow when teacher and student concern themselves with the artifact, the play, rather than with circumstantial data.

Four heresies can distract us from the true faith. Dryden, speaking through Lisideius in *Of Dramatic Poesy*, expresses it well: "A play ought to be a just and lively image of human nature, representing its passions and humors, and the changes of fortune to which it is subject, for the delight and instruction of mankind."

I. *The Poetic Heresy.* The great plays of the Greeks and the Elizabethans were written as poetry; all plays, to be great, must be written as poetry; and a modern play, if written as poetry, deserves more serious attention than a prose drama. This heresy is difficult to scotch. Kenneth Tynan has argued that, ever since Ibsen, prose does the job as well as poetry, and Denis Goacher, speaking over the B.B.C., has defined drama as "action, that which is done or performed to carry the narrative for-

ward towards a conclusion," and the average playgoer would rather see a prose play with lots of action than a modern poetic drama that gets nowhere on the stage. But Eliot's plays (among other plays by Fry, Anderson, Millay, etc.) are still being presented to undergraduates as the way to salvation: if Broadway will repent, there is still hope. It seems undeniable that poetic drama which procrastinates is fully as tedious as a prose play which dawdles; perhaps more so; but the champions of poetic drama are boisterous, and woe to those who get in their way.

II. *The Heresy of Leonard Lyons.* This emerges from a clutter of badly faded backstage tidbits, and is enthusiastically, even archly, passed on by the second-rate actor who now teaches plays for the English Department or the Speech Department. He has the text of Congreve before him; but he prefers to talk about the dead fish he slipped into the hand of an unsuspecting actress some twenty years ago. Or, if he is more up on the gossip that he offers for college credit, he will inform his class that Jane Cowl insists on being lighted in surprise pink, that *Macbeth* can be done in ponchos, that Tennessee Williams' agents supported him for seven years, and that Kazan won't cast unless Karl Malden is seated beside him.

III. *The Heresy of the Rich Life.* (Somewhat similar to the preceding heresy, but not quite the same.) A dramatist's biography will explain all kinds of things about the play, and probably the play itself. For example, Fielding's life is the best guide to Fielding's dramatic art; *Tom Thumb* makes little sense when divorced from a specific historical situation. Yet to think of the dramatist as *deus in machina* creates real dangers in the interpretation of plays. Most plays are not squishy with the juice of autobiography. They don't sublimate unhappy love affairs. They don't necessarily deal with personal spite. An author's affairs are divorceable from an author's dramatic creations; the awards he receives have no vital relationship to his work; his education is relevant only in some bric-a-brac fashion; his oddities in dress and his conversations with André Gide are tangential in the long run, and Eternity is the longest run of all.

IV. *The Heresy of the Inevitable Masterpiece.* The drama is a kind of precipitant created by the ferment of social and political conditions. *Everyman* is a great play because of the church ritual and guild organization that made it possible. This heresy, at least as old as cultural anthropology, states, in a literary way, what others mean when they say the steam engine came into existence because of a well-defined need and propitious circumstances. Shakespeare can be explained away in terms of Hooker and Machiavelli, and Clifford Odets becomes a dramatist of the American Depression; Chekhov is someone who argues with actors and directors and censors. But a great crisis can exist without an *inevitable* great play. If the great play appears, it should not be treated as a crystallization of elements that were bound to crystallize, for any teacher who so treats them is superior to surprise: he knew it all the time. *A great play is never inevitable.*

The function of a good teacher is to teach the play, and to ignore as much as possible his preference for one kind of play over another. (Eliot's experiments in poetic drama do not loom as giants over the modern world.) He should minimize the chit-chat. He should try not to treat the play as a living proof of something carved on a dramatist's tombstone. And he should disregard the

notion that playwrights listen to the ringing of an off-stage bell in the Theatre of History, and write a great play as a conditioned response.

Plays can be taught informatively and excitingly by many methods. The undergraduate with limited playgoing experience should want to expand his acquaintance with living theatre, and he will, if his attention is not distracted by one or another heresy apparently not inherent in the teaching of drama. He should believe, along with Hamlet, that the play's the thing.

HAROLD OREL
University of Kansas

ADDENDUM ON PUBLIC RECITATION IN JAPAN

To the Editor:

I enjoyed reading Mr. Sloan's article on the role of public recitation in Japan (*QJS*, December 1957), especially the part concerning dramatic narration. It is certainly true that one soon becomes used to seeing the squat figures of reciters (*uta kata*) and musicians (*samisen kata*) on the stage as integral parts of a dramatic performance. In fact so used to them had I become that I had come to take their positioning on stage for granted. It was therefore a shock to realize that never had I seen them on stage as Mr. Sloan would have them—the musicians on the reciters' right.

Wondering whether my eyes had been playing tricks on me, I did some checking. I found that whereas Mr. Sloan's arrangement is used occasionally in kabuki, it is never used in puppet plays, which was what Mr. Sloan was specifically referring to.

In the puppet theatre it is the invariable rule, regardless of the number of reciters and musicians, that the musicians sit to the left of the reciters. (This is also true in puppet plays adapted for kabuki.) I have come across only two exceptions to this in kabuki. The first is in the dance play *The Wisteria Girl*, where the reciters sit on the left, separated from the musicians by the width of the stage. There is also a special arrangement which is sometimes used when staging plays of noh origin. If the *nagauta* orchestra is very large (it may include up to twelve reciters, twelve *samisen* players, plus other musicians) and if the two lead reciters are considered of equal skill, the two of them may share the lead reciter's role. In this case the first *samisen* will sit between the two, so that each will have a *samisen* player on his left assuring the close coordination of singer and musician. There are undoubtedly other exceptions as well, but I think it is safe to say that in nine out of ten kabuki plays it is the other way around.

It is only on the noh stage that the reciters are traditionally placed to the left of the musicians.

This is a small matter but I just wanted to set the record straight.

JAMES R. BRANDON
American Embassy, Tokyo

FULLER EXPLANATION

To the Editor:

In *QJS*, October 1958 Mrs. Dorothy Childs took issue with my letter (February 1958) captioned *There Was This Man. . . .* According to Mrs. Childs, I should be censured for what she calls my "warm-hearted approval" of the conversion in language which I was discussing.

I assure Mrs. Childs and anyone else who may have interpreted my article as she did that I neither approve nor disapprove of the practice. I was recording the currency of the substitution of *this* and *these* for the articles *a, an,* and *the*. If usage implies approval, such con-

versions have been approved by better than average speakers—or, as I stated in the letter, "by people who certainly leave nothing to be desired otherwise in their use of the language."

Hence, my contention is two-fold: 1) that use of the conversion by good speakers may indicate a growing acceptance of it which, perhaps, is heralding a future change in our language; and 2) that the basic logic for such change (changes in language are usually logical, we are told) may stem from the inadequate function of the indefinite articles *a* and *an*, and the definite article *the*. The impetus to change is already at hand in the influence of the Damon Runyon character.

At present, I should readily agree, the conversion *is* ungrammatical and, therefore, is not to be desired. I certainly do not allow it to pass by my notice when it occurs in my classroom. I cannot agree, however, with Mrs. Childs' charge that there is an "odor of conformity" or even "laziness" or unawareness of true values in merely recognizing that the conversion exists. Language is, and always has been, a living, growing, *changing* phenomenon, and, distasteful as it might seem to Mrs. Childs, *conformity* or *acceptance* of any change by people who use the language is the very *heart* of the growth of language.

Actually, Mrs. Childs' remarks are, in effect, echoes of familiar protests by teachers and scholars who, in my opinion, should know better. The heart of their attitude seems to lie in the belief that the language is, as we have it at present, a *fait accompli*, finished, polished to perfection, *done*. They would have us, therefore, preserve it in all its correctness and purity from defilement. What they overlook is that eventually the users of the language will decide, and that on this basis there is a continual *flux* of the language with old forms being dropped, changed, new forms being adopted or else rejected—and all by *acceptance*, final acceptance, by educated users of the language.

This, Mrs. Childs, was all I was attempting to analyze with respect to a particular current usage. And now I pick up a newspaper and find a former First Lady writing that one day while riding in an airplane she chanced to turn back to view the passengers "and there in the last row of seats, I saw *this* boy" whom she recognized to be her nephew. Well, it makes *me* think, anyway. And this from one who is internationally known as speaker, author, and world traveler. With such acceptance, *conformity* for you and me, Mrs. Childs, may not be too far away.

R. Reyes
Ohio University

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Speech Association of America (Bryant, Harshbarger, and Oliver elected by the Association, Black elected by the Administrative Council, Howell elected by the Legislative Assembly) submits the following nominations in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and By-laws.

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT
(One to be elected)

Frederick W. Haberman, University of Wisconsin
Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
(Two to be elected)

Robert D. Clark, University of Oregon
Marie K. Hochmuth, University of Illinois
Jack Matthews, University of Pittsburgh
Ernest J. Wrage, Northwestern University

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Western Area (Four to be elected)

Elizabeth B. Carr, University of Hawaii
Bernarr Cooper, University of New Mexico
Milton Dobkin, Humboldt State College, Arcata, California
Halbert S. Greaves, University of Utah
Clifford E. Hamar, Lewis & Clark College, Portland, Oregon
Fred McMahon, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California
Orville Pence, University of Washington
Rex E. Robinson, Utah State University, Logan

Central Area (Four to be elected)

Charles Balcer, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
Samuel L. Becker, State University of Iowa
Earl W. Blank, North Eastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma
Keith Brooks, Ohio State University
Robert Haakenson, University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch
Frances McCurdy, University of Missouri
Bea Olmstead, Hamstramak Public Schools, Hamtramak, Michigan
Dorothy Weirich, Webster Groves High School, Webster Groves, Missouri

Eastern Area (Four to be elected)

Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell University
Elton S. Carter, Pennsylvania State University
Geraldine Garrison, Consultant, Speech & Hearing Services, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford
Ota Thomas Reynolds, Hunter College, New York City
Harold M. Scholl, State Teachers College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey
Clarice Tatman, Mount Holyoke College
A. Isabelle Timmins, Boston Public Schools
Hollis White, Queens College, Flushing, New York

Southern Area (Four to be elected)

Leighton M. Ballew, University of Georgia
Frank B. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
Frank W. Hale, Jr., Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama
M. Blair Hart, University of Arkansas
Robert C. Jeffrey, University of Virginia
Wesley Wiksell, Louisiana State University
Eugene E. White, University of Miami, Coral Gables
Donald M. Williams, University of Texas

REPRESENTATIVES-AT-LARGE IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(Thirty to be elected)

Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos
Albert H. Austen, Rutgers—State University of New Jersey
Merrill Baker, University of South Dakota
David K. Berlo, Michigan State University
Gifford Blyton, University of Kentucky
Gladys L. Borchers, University of Wisconsin
Ernest Bormann, Florida State University, Tallahassee
George Bohman, Wayne State University, Detroit
Wiley C. Bowyer, Mineola Public Schools, New York
Winston L. Brembeck, Univesity of Wisconsin
Wayne E. Brockriede, University of Illinois
Paul A. Carmack, Ohio State University
Elnora D. Carrino, New York State Department of Education, Albany
Charles A. Caruson, Hopkins High School, Minnesota
Betty May Collins, Technical High School, Memphis, Tennessee
Raymond L. DeBoer, Colorado State College, Greeley
Helen M. Donovan, New York City Public Schools
Dale W. Drum, Long Beach State College, California
Lloyd P. Dudley, Pueblo College, Pueblo, Colorado
Wayne C. Eubank, University of New Mexico
H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue University
Arlene Fitze, Montclair Senior High School, Montclair, New Jersey
Mary Louise Gehring, Stetson University, Deland, Florida
Robert G. Gunderson, Indiana University
Don Geiger, University of California, Berkeley
Burrell Hansen, Utah State University, Logan
Donald A. Harrington, University of Florida, Gainesville
Gilbert Hartwig, Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg
James H. Henning, University of West Virginia, Morgantown
Anthony Hillbruner, Los Angeles State College
Wilbur Samuel Howell, Princeton University
William S. Howell, University of Minnesota
Ray Irwin, Syracuse University
Ruth Bechey Irwin, Ohio State University
Carl Isaacson, Idaho State College
T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama

Freda Kenner, Messick High School, Memphis, Tennessee
Robert D. Kully, Los Angeles State College
Jerome B. Landfield, Oberlin College, Ohio
Ralph L. Lane, Glenbrook High School, Northbrook, Illinois
Mary Latimer, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
James F. Lynch, Indiana University
James McBurney, Northwestern University
William McCoard, University of Southern California
Marguerite Metcalf, Hall High School, Little Rock, Arkansas
N. Edd Miller, University of Michigan
Glenn E. Mills, Northwestern University
Charles E. A. Moore, Proviso Township High School, Maywood, Illinois
Roy Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana
Harold E. Nelson, Pennsylvania State University
Doris S. Niles, Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma
Thomas Nilsen, University of Washington
Joseph H. North, Iowa State College, Ames
Robert P. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University
Donald Olson, University of Nebraska
Carrie Rasmussen, Madison Public Schools, Wisconsin
Ronald F. Reid, Washington University, St. Louis
Frank Roberts, Portland State College, Oregon
Ray H. Sandefur, University of Akron
Malcolm Sillars, Los Angeles State College
Charles D. Smith, Syracuse University
Donald L. Torrence, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois
Robert Clyde Yarbrough, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth

H. Clay Harshbarger
Robert T. Oliver
John Black
William S. Howell
Donald C. Bryant, *Chairman*

RHETORICIANS AND FREE SPEECH

[Editor's note: The following is the substance of a letter received just as we were going to press. It is an additional contribution to the discussion raised by Thomas Nilsen's article in our October number. It is included here because of its close relation to the letters published on pages 65-67. Mr. Smith adds the following comment in his covering note: "I feel it is unfortunate that the American press by and large avoids mention of the infringement which certain countries make on the right of assembly, speech, and the press. Doubtless, it is due to pressure, direct or indirect, exerted by certain interests. The *New York Times* does, on occasion, carry such items, but they do not receive prominence."]

To the Editor:

Thomas R. Nilsen's "Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process" (*QJS*, October 1958) has made a helpful contribution on the operation of New York's Madison Avenue and the advertising philosophy of mid-twentieth century America. Having lived in Los Angeles during one such political campaign cited by the author, I can attest to the truth of some of his statements.

At the same time, this article might be sub-titled, "The Great Unsaid," for the author has stimulated our thought to much more which needs to be told.

It is curious that a profession devoted to the spoken word has taken so little (public) interest in the struggle for free speech. With a few notable exceptions, we must look to contributors from other disciplines for the bulk of original material in this field. We, alas, often have contented ourselves with lesser game, with studies pioneered by colleagues in political science, history, social psychology.

Nilsen's task was not an easy one, and neither is ours, if we continue the struggle. Where are the rhetoricians who will defy public opinion to write on the oppression of free speech in the interests of religion and church in various countries of the "free world" lest the faith of the less educated be weakened? Where are the rhetoricians who will defy public opinion to write on the discouragement of the free mind in this country by the efforts of clergyman in this church or that to see that their communicants do not hear "the other side"?

If we are fair and thorough in our examination of the facts, dare we shrink back from our duty because we shall be labeled "bigot," "atheist," "ignorant"?

Lest the demagogue believe this is a call to arms for him, let him put away his hood, his fiery cross, his loaded pen, and his specious arguments. A scholarly journal has no place for his kind. Rather, our profession should be convinced that we will champion—by studied investigation—the cause of free speech and liberty, even if it means stepping on the toes of economic, ecclesiastic, politic, or academic interests. As members of a profession dedicated to the principle that truth can victoriously grapple with falsehood in the arena of ideas, we must jealously guard our right to full and free debate.

Morality is determined by choice. One cannot have made a right moral choice unless he has the opportunity of hearing another side. Admittedly, this may lose some members from a group, but those who remain will surely be stronger having been convinced their choice is the correct one. Yet if members are lost, this is the risk one takes in championing the democratic process.

Freedom of speech does not, of course, presume that there are no limitations placed upon the speaker. As Justice Holmes pointed out forty years ago (Schenck *v.* United States), "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing a panic." The call for freedom of speech does presume, however, that truth will most strongly mold our lives when we have the privilege of *choosing* it.

John Milton fearlessly called for this freedom when he wrote,

> Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do ingloriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple: who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?

May I suggest the editors of the *Journal* consider manuscripts in the immediate future dealing with restrictions upon free speech in the interests of religious, political, and social isms anywhere in the world. Much remains to be said in these critical areas.

ROBERT W. SMITH
Midwestern University

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

SOME RECENT BOOKS ON THE DRAMA

William G. McCollom

Critics write as public figures or private tutors, and this fact dominates much of what they say. When Bernard Shaw or Harold Clurman criticizes a play or an actor, we are always aware of the public figure and his personal voice. The academic critic, a Ronald Peacock or a David Grossvogel, has probably reconciled himself to being "understood," rather than "heard," and he may reflect that we do not often read for the sake of understanding. If this reflection causes him to lose interest in persuasion, he may be making a serious mistake, although the success of some recent criticism indicates that austerity, even obscurity, is not entirely without market value.

Shaw on Theatre, edited by E. J. West, is a miscellany written over fifty years by a public figure and dealing with the theatre, the drama, and more specifically Shaw, Shakespeare, Victorian theatrical practices, censorship, directing, acting, and so on. Though not a profound critic of the drama, Shaw must have been one of the most observant theatregoers who ever lived and one of the most exacting directors. He had a prodigious memory for stage business and as a director believed in taking a hundred or more notes at a single rehearsal of one of his plays. More and more it becomes clear that Shaw was primarily a great and shrewd entertainer, an intellectual clown of a very high order. No one else could insult an actor so charmingly, for no one else could equal him in good humor. His prose is close to the best in English because of the super-natural élan, the vital energy that boils through his sentences, driving the reader before it and sweeping away the rust of rational objection.

Next to writing about Shaw, he liked to write about Shakespeare. Two of the most enjoyable pieces in the book are a review of Beerbohm-Tree's production of *Much Ado About Nothing* (1905) and a series of letters to the *Times Literary Supplement* on the subject of "Shakespeare: A Standard Text" (1921). Both contributions reveal Shaw's idoloclastic approach to Shakespeare, Shaw on Shakespeare strongly resembles Aristophanes on Euripides; both critics had obviously given careful attention to what they were ridiculing. But Shaw's view of Shakespeare in general and *Much Ado* in particular is not very illuminating; to speak as if the "music" of Shakespeare were all and the libretto nothing is to miss the unity of plot, character, and language in the dramatist and to suffer from the delusion that Shakespeare's language is something to be admired in isolation from the whole work of art. This is an error that Coleridge, A. C. Bradley, or G. Wilson Knight would not have made.

An interesting small point in the review is the display of comic rage Shaw puts on when he notices that in this production Don Pedro said "Speak low, if you speak love" immediately after Hero said "God defend the lute should be like the case!" (II. i. 97) To be sure,

Mr. McCollom (Ph.D., Cornell, 1944), Associate Professor of Dramatic Arts, Western Reserve University, is the author of Tragedy *(Macmillan, New York, 1957).*

Don Pedro's line hardly follows, but in the earliest editions, the sequence isn't much better, and some modern editors give Don Pedro's line to Margaret, who is talking to Benedick—or to Balthasar, as Lewis Theobald suggested in the eighteenth century.

The letters on "Shakespeare: A Standard Text" are part of a vivacious controversy in *TLS* involving Sir William Poel and the pioneers of the New Bibliography: A. W. Pollard, Percy Simpson, and Dover Wilson. The bibliographers maintained that the punctuation in the early texts is "dramatic" rather than grammatical and that modern editions should respect it, since it reflects stage practice and may even give us the blissful experience of looking over Shakespeare's shoulder as he added immortal points to his immortal words. Sir William pooh-poohed this idea and proceeded to argue that he or any good actor could punctuate Shakespeare's lines far better than the quartos had. After Percy Simpson, the author of *Shakespeare's Punctuation,* had chided Poel, Shaw charged into the debate and declared that there are only two sane ways of editing Shakespeare: one may reprint the early editions exactly or edit them as editors since the eighteenth century had been doing. With Olympian majesty he refused to admit that any compromise is possible. The joust worked up a good deal of intellectual heat, with Shaw doing more than his share of misrepresenting the position of his opponents. Yet after thirty-five years, his main contention, that several transcripts probably stood between Shakespeare's manuscript and the printed text, seems to hold up at least as well as that of the specialists. Or so the preface to the Yale reprint of the Folio would suggest.

For Shaw, play directing was mainly a matter of placing his actors and coaching their line reading so that the author's text could be transmitted with maximum exactness. He would have had little sympathy with Mr. Clurman's emphasis on the director's creative manipulation of sub-text. And what would Mr. Clurman think of Shaw's statement that the director should "never discuss a passage with a player"?

In *Lies Like Truth: Theatre Reviews and Essays,* Harold Clurman emerges as in the best sense a man of the world, a leading statesman of the modern theatre, and a critic of penetrating sociological insight coupled with a sure sense of dramatic art. Much of the time he is writing frankly as a moralist. His chief concern in this book is to convert American theatre people and theatre audiences to a selfless love of good art. Throughout, he is disturbed by the American obsession with good publicity and good box office, an illness that affects playwrights, directors, and actors alike. Clurman is afflicted with neither chauvinism nor Miniver Cheevyism; while deploring the lack of a fine, continuing repertory in the American theatre, he is ready to defend current American playwriting, directing, and technical production as against the English or the French achievement, and he is impatient with those dramatic critics, "eminent among dramatic critics," who find nothing but crudity in the American theatrical scene.

"The critic's first job," says Mr. Clurman, "is to make clear what a play is about." This problem he always attacks with confidence and usually with clarifying results. As a prominent exponent of the Method, he tends, of course, to state his interpretations in infinitive phrases. *Desire Under the Elms,* for example, presents "the struggle to find the reward of life through the power of

acquisitive will . . . pitted against the urge to forgo the profits of this will for the fruits of love." Clurman seems to me most impressive when he is dealing with modern drama, particularly American. His judgments on Wilder, Saroyan, Odets, and Miller are fastidious without being finicky; he can see, for example, the vice of sentimentality in Saroyan without concluding that this dramatist is beneath contempt. His discussion of French drama is very good, especially in the social implications of the subject; and the following sentence is the best short judgment on Chekhov I have ever read: "Chekhov triumphs because the gentleness and goodness of his soul, the wit of his understanding, the acuteness of his observation are so balanced, so loving, so unemphatically honest, probing, discreet, economical and impeccably true in taste and tone that every moment of his plays is transformed into the most penetrating poetry."

As this passage shows, Clurman has the gift, so necessary to the journalistic critic, of saying much in a few words. But along with this virtue goes an unwillingness, even in a long review, to support judgments by quotation and close analysis. Speaking of *The Autumn Garden,* the critic rightly indicates that Hellman's play is about as good as it could be without being at all great, without having, let us say, the overtones of Chekhov. The point could be supported by quoting and analyzing such a speech as the following by General Griggs:

> I guess I was. (*Slowly, carefully*) So at any given moment you're only the sum total of your life up to then. There are no big moments you can reach unless you've a pile of smaller moments to stand on. That big hour of decision, the turning point of your life, the someday you've counted on when you'd suddenly wipe out your past mistakes, do the work you'd never done, think the way you'd never thought, have what you've never had—it just doesn't come suddenly. You've trained yourself for it while you waited—or you've let it all run past you and frittered yourself away. (*Shakes his head*) I've frittered myself away, Crossman.

Griggs has been presented as a strong, kindly, stoical man putting up with an impossible wife. Now, discovering that she is dangerously ill, he cannot decide to leave her. The quoted speech is important and moving because the General's decision against deserting his wife will impress the audience as humane, yet he himself feels that his humanity is a weakness. The complexity and relativity of moral choice are very forcibly brought home by the General's words, which also underline the autumnal theme of the play. The language of the speech is hard, clear, and true to the speaker; the plainness of the vocabulary expresses his simplicity and lack of pretension. Yet for all its honesty, the speech is prosaic to the point of triteness: if phrases like "no big moments," the "big hour of decision," the "someday you've counted on," and the repeated "frittered away" are realistic, they also fail to expand, diversify, and concentrate the moment as an inconspicuously poetic style could do.

No doubt this analysis would strike Mr. Clurman as excessively literary, for he emphasizes that a play is an action, not words. But the words are what the writer writes; they are the first index to his meaning and quality. If the dramatic critic is to criticize the play, he cannot forever ignore the words of the play. These words, spoken or written, are what tell us what to think of the writer. Whatever he intends and whatever the actors make of him, the words are what *he* said. Mr. Clurman's tendency to slight this aspect of the play results in some superficial judgments (for the words are not superficial). Speaking of

A Streetcar Named Desire, he attacks those critics who failed "to understand the author's intention" to make Blanche a sensitive, admirable aristocrat (p. 74). But the Streetcar's path to Cemeteries and the Elysian Fields is paved with good intentions that won't support the load. The crucial weakness of the play is that what Blanche says is so often cheap, melodramatic, and closer to *Redbook* or even *True Confessions* than to the standard poets she admires, including Elizabeth Barrett Browning. When she rants about "this dark march toward whatever it is we're approaching" or asserts that "a cultivated woman, a woman of intelligence and breeding, can enrich a man's life immeasurably!" she sounds like a third-rate preacher or, alternatively, the "personals" section of *The Saturday Review.* At moments like these, dramatic criticism must be literary criticism.

Turning from Broadway to the graduate seminar, we come to *The Self-Conscious Stage in Modern French Drama,* by David Grossvogel, which studies the avant-garde tradition in French drama from the time of Jarry and Apollinaire to the present. Playwrights receiving special attention are Cocteau, Giraudoux, Claudel, Sartre, Anouilh, Crommelynck, and Ghelderode. For Mr. Grossvogel, the two finest dramatic modes are tragedy, which induces profound participation on the part of the audience, and "the Farce," which, avoiding realism, creates great and grotesque images awakening painful but illuminating laughter. He believes that these two modes develop from essentially the same sources in the human mind, and he describes many farces as tragic. The book suggests that the best modern tragedies are farcical tragedies.

He traces much of the self-consciousness of modern French drama to romantic drama, which failed because it failed to trust its audiences; and he condemns Cocteau and Anouilh on much the same ground. These dramatists wanted, says Mr. Grossvogel, to achieve tragic inevitability but created characters and scenes that made inevitability impossible. Giraudoux and Claudel, for all their poetic gifts, fell short of great drama because they refused to allow adequate participation by the audience in the dramatic action. Crommelynck and Ghelderode, on the other hand, attained a kind of greatness because their poetic imaginations were able to find images genuinely expressive of the popular consciousness and unspoiled by the excessive self-consciousness of an Anouilh.

The two great curses of academic writing are dullness and pretentiousness. Mr. Grossvogel is certainly not dull but he is completely unwilling to express his meaning directly. Commenting on a line in Anouilh, the critic writes:

> 'All the people of [your] past'—the fallacious sentence that was to have granted the protagonist a homogeneous body of myth—discloses another and more important meaning as the expression of the existentialist's fundamental confinement. Because he believes that no one escapes being the aggregate of his past actions, the classical concept of the immutable gesture performed throughout time is confirmed by a philosophical credence that likewise assumes the inevitable antecedents of any such gesture. (P. 186.)

Mr. Grossvogel wants to say that the quoted phrase not only refers to the connection between the hero and his ancestors but alludes to the philosophical doctrine of necessitarianism. But the passage is ambiguous throughout. In what sense is "the immutable gesture" performed "throughout time"? Is a "philosophical credence" a particular creed (i.e., existentialism) or the belief which

philosophically minded persons grant to that creed? Does existentialism hold that immutable gestures have inevitable antecedents? Are antecedents (previous events) ever avoidable once they have taken place? And finally, does the passage imply that the existentialists think human action fated or devoid of free will? The existentialism of Sartre, who is the leading existentialist discussed by Mr. Grossvogel, holds exactly the opposite.

A play is a series of particular actions performed by a particular group of people. But although he devotes a long chapter to Anouilh and his twenty plays, Grossvogel rarely gives the sense of a drama as an artistic whole. By abstracting various features of the whole group of plays, he is able to point out that the Anouilh hero is neurotic, morbid, self-centered, just as immoral as the people he hates, etc., but the critic's chief interest is in attacking the playwright with a barrage of syllogisms—syllogisms which fail to persuade because their terms are too vague. And even if his dialectic were more successful, his criticism would be unbalanced, for it pays no attention to the texture of Anouilh's writing. One has only to read the first page of *The Waltz of the Toreadors* or *Antigone* to recognize the brilliance of the dramatist. Mr. Grossvogel hides this light under a bushel of enthymemes.

Ronald Peacock's *The Art of Drama* is a study in applied aesthetics—the "art" in his title should be stressed—and if the reader must read him warily, this is because of the scope and complexity of his subject. Since drama is a composite art, Mr. Peacock holds that this form can be understood only by finding a principle underlying all the arts or at least by discovering what principle explains the fusion of the arts in the drama. The key to art he finds in a concept of imagery, or picture-making very broadly understood. Every work of art is seen as an "intertexture" or combination or fusion of various images, or to put it another way, a work of art is an aesthetic "context" of the imagery—as opposed, for example, to a scientific context.

The early chapters develop this view of artistic imagery and lead to the author's definition: "Art is experience re-enacted as idea, a formula of imagery, or imagery-within-language, being the instrument of re-enactment." Chapter Seven is a full elucidation of this sentence. In general it may be said that Mr. Peacock leans toward the idealist view of art, stressing variety-in-unity and treating the art-work as potentially existent. The work of art is "there" but by no means simply there, for just as a metaphor in Shakespeare is a meeting-place of several functions, so is the metaphor an element in a yet larger unity.

The author finds the essence of drama in *persons acting*—a literal translation of Aristotle's *prattontes*, though Peacock does not mention this fact. The persons acting are the "medium" of drama. The ultimate purpose of drama is "some general idea or emotion" embodied in the work yet determining its particular form. In keeping with the terminology developed in the early chapters, plot, *dramatis personae*, metaphors, symbols, etc. are described as imageries.

If I outline the structure of Mr. Peacock's searching study, it is partly to remind myself of his general plan, which, though eminently logical, sacrifices extreme salience in favor of that very intertexture he takes to be the essence of art. Despite its logic, the book is impressive primarily because the writer constantly demonstrates a sensitive and subtle perception of the ways in which

the many elements of art address, affect, alter, transform, and aggrandize each other in the process of fusing. Without feeling that if he quotes twelve lines from Tennyson he must write a thousand lines of explication, he can quickly indicate a full and balanced response to what the artist is doing.

Since his book is called *The Art of Drama* and since he does not make drama his central concern until he is about two-thirds of his way to the end, he may arouse impatience in the student of "theatre" or in those who think, as did the reviewer in *Essays in Criticism*, that Mr. Peacock has put into writing too much of his preliminary thinking. But if one is glad to learn of the analogies between the musical ideals of Mallarmé and the dramatic-musical verse of Shakespeare, Peacock will be extremely rewarding.

Most critics approach the drama with either a literary bias, as does a Cleanth Brooks, or a theatrical bias, as does a Gordon Craig. Mr. Peacock is remarkable in that he is very much the literary man who realizes that dramatic dialogue is not primarily "words on a page," in his phrase, but the speech of persons acting. As he says, drama is tied to impersonation; and the dramatist whose "private ideas or feelings or beliefs are more important to him than his respect for persons" fails as a dramatist. Since Mr. Peacock knows very well what words on a page can do, he is in no danger of being dismissed as a crude advocate of mindless spectacle. Somewhat paradoxically, his understanding of Baudelaire and Hölderlin gives him the right to say what drama is and to set it out as a distinct though composite form.

BOOKS REVIEWED

SHAW ON THEATRE. Edited by E. J. West. New York: Hill and Wang, 1958; pp. 306. $3.95.

LIES LIKE TRUTH: THEATRE REVIEWS AND ESSAYS. By Harold Clurman. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 300. $6.00.

THE SELF-CONSCIOUS STAGE IN MODERN FRENCH DRAMA. By David I. Grossvogel. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958; pp. 378. $5.00.

THE ART OF DRAMA. By Ronald Peacock. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. 263. $5.00.

* * *

CHAUCER: A CRITICAL APPRECIATION. By Paull F. Baum. Durham: Duke University Press, 1958; pp. 229+xi. $6.00.

Mr. Baum has written a critical appreciation of Chaucer, though I dare say his over-all attitude towards that great poet is more critical than appreciative. The scholar has had the last word, but this is not always the same as the last word *on* Chaucer. To example Baum's corrective tone one might set down two, I hope, not unrepresentative passages. The first occurs at the outset, when Mr. Baum introduces Chaucer's magnificent dream vision, *The Book of the Duchess*: "(That he wrote this poem at the Duke's request or command is at best 'a fanciful surmise.') In 1370 'he entered upon a diplomatic career,' says Manly in rather grandiose terms." Why grandiose?

Mr. Baum's windup is not any less crotchety:

> It could be taken as an index that his best success in presenting character is with Pandarus and the Wife of Bath. There is then no need to exalt his work as a civil servant to match his genius in another sphere, nor any need to deplore his failings as a genius. His imperfections "should be regarded as qualities rather than faults." He will not suffer from the free recognition of them as much as he has suffered from mistaken eulogy.

This is all very pettifogging, and it is absurd. Geoffrey Chaucer does not need anyone to defend him; but I suppose two fairer indices of his achievement would be what George Lyman Kittredge has rightly called the first—possibly it is still the best—"psychological

novel," *Troilus and Cryseyde,* and notwithstanding Matthew Arnold's over-esteemed complaint that Chaucer lacked "high seriousness," we have the always modern, ever fresh *Canterbury Tales.* As for Mr. Baum's critical premise that one ought dwell caressingly upon the *defects* of a master to get the best out of him, I doubt that too. Is it not more nearly true, as William James remarked, that "real culture lives by sympathies and admirations, not by dislikes and disdains"?

To act on James' generous epigram: there is a great deal in Baum's book for which one should be grateful. He has collated an enormous range of Chaucer scholarship, particularly on *The Pardoner's Tale* and the *Troilus* Epilogue. Baum's citations have taken years to harvest and any aspiring Chaucer scholar would be a fool, worse, an ingrate, not to welcome this treasure-trove gathered into one neat volume. Though it is too bad depreciation mars his book, one must remember no sane scholar writes at great length on a subject to which he does not feel a positive commitment; but, sad to say, at times a life of scholarship in the academy results in the jejune prose of a Mr. Dryasdust.

To end on something cheerful: Mr. Baum delves into the "patchwork Epilogue" to the *Troilus,* "a medley of seventeen stanzas, with twelve different subjects, shifting back and forth from grave to gay." Mr. Baum finds this richness somewhat vulgar, but the reader can all the more value the infinite variety of Chaucer's masterpiece *by dint of* Baum's deep, profound explication. "Art," says Henry James, "is our flounderings shown"; and Mr. Baum has explained the craft of one pretty big, but slippery, literary fish.

The critic prefers Robert Henryson's *East Lynne* finale for Cryseyde. The Scot made Cryseyde into a camp follower of "fleschlie lust," used up by Diomed ("Quhen Diomed had all his appetyte/And mair, fulfillit of this fair Ladie"), who loses her looks in the comeuppance of leprosy. Henryson's drab even accepts alms from a triumphant Troilus who subliminally recognizes her; this sad reunion takes place despite the fact Chaucer, before Henryson, had killed off Troilus! His statement of morbid preference is Mr. Baum's right under the First Amendment. But, here, though all reason may be with Baum, all instinct and the verdict of time oppose him. Among the English poets, whose Cryseyde has survived? The boring and groveling leper of Henryson? The outright slut of Shakespeare: "There's language in her eye, her cheek, her lip, nay, her foot speaks; her wanton spirits look out at every joint and motive of her body"? Or, the marrying kind of Cryseyde in Dryden's maiming of Shakespeare, who breaks the vital courtly code of Andreas Capellanus with her bourgeois bedside neurosis: "The holy Priest shall make us one for ever!"? No, the Cryseyde who abides and endures is the all-too-human, mysterious "fresshe wommanliche wif" of Chaucer. The great "makere," like a true courtly knight, has left her to heaven and the ages:

> Ne me list this sely womman chyde
> Forther than the storye wol devyse,
> Hire name, allas! is punysshed so wide,
> That for hire gilt it oughte ynough suffise.
> And if I myghte excuse hire any wise,
> For she so sory was for hire untrouthe,
> Iwis, I wolde excuse hire yet for routhe.

HERBERT FEINSTEIN
University of California, Berkeley

IN PRAISE OF LOVE. By Maurice Valency. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xi+319. $6.50.

Professor Valency's book does not pretend to originality and is frankly an introductory survey. It nevertheless traces with precision, balance, and wit the complex states of mind which gave rise to the subjects and forms of the Renaissance love lyric, and does so while avoiding the preciosity of language and thought which sometimes creeps into the writing of even the most well-intentioned scholars.

Mr. Valency's achievement is all the more admirable considering the temptations provided by his subject. Since he is surveying the tradition which culminated in the *Vita Nuova,* he must cover, however sparingly, the work of some rather insubstantial poets. He neither succumbs to the temptation of making such work more important than it is, nor gets lost unravelling the tangle of ideas and conventions from which it sprang or to which it contributed.

The same perspective and acumen stand him in good stead as he delineates other historical, literary, social, and psychological origins of Renaissance love-poetry. With the spirit of a scholar-detective, he examines the evidence, discovers the essential questions at the heart of the whole puzzle, and attempts to answer them as best he can. How, he asks, can it be that the love-lyric came into being and flourished at a time when in real life women were treated more as a commodity or a servant than as a romantic ideal? How could two oppos-

ing strains of love-poetry, the one treating the knight as aggressive warrior, the other as passive courtier, spring up and flourish simultaneously? What segments of society benefited most from the ideals and aspirations voiced in the love-lyric? Why? What specific ideas and techniques were used in the love-lyric? What factors help to account for its decline in France? How did such great poets as Petrarch Italy, and its eventual return to popularity in France? How did such great poets as Patrarch and Dante make use of its offerings? What residue of the Renaissance love tradition do we find in later romantic literature?

Such questions can hardly be praised too highly. Any student of Renaissance literature or manners must ask and attempt to answer them. He can hardly begin this task better than by reading *In Praise of Love*.

IRVING DEER
State Normal College
Ellendale, North Dakota

OTHELLO. By William Shakespeare. Edited by M. R. Ridley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958; pp. lxx+246. $3.85.

M. R. Ridley's New Arden *Othello* is more "eclectic" (Ridley's term) and, as regards critical commentary, more of a disappointment than his New Arden "revision" of *Antony and Cleopatra* (1954). Of the three "certain limited aims" which in the *Othello* Preface the editor purports to have kept in view—to help the reader "arrive at some reasonable conclusion as to what Shakespeare may be supposed to have written; . . . appreciate Shakespeare's dramatic craftsmanship; and . . . . understand precisely what Shakespeare meant"—he has fulfilled only the last. A distinguished edition of Shakespeare's text, fully and minutely annotated, is accompanied by an introduction and appendices in which, on matters of bibliography and interpretation, Ridley proves supererogatory, discursive, and vague.

The editor shrugs off in half a page the problem of dating *Othello;* his edition cites neither the record in the Revels Accounts of its performance at Whitehall on 1 November 1604, the supposed allusion to it in *The Honest Whore* (1604), nor its entry in the Stationers' Register on 6 October 1621. "Nor have I made any detailed comparison of the play with its presumed source," he blandly notifies us; "any reader can make the comparison for himself." Accordingly, in his one-third-page introductory section on "Sources" he touches on the *Hecatommithi* alone (without supplying the full name of its author, incidentally), possibly unaware that in recent years Krappe, Winstanley, and others have proposed additional *Othello* sources. He also muses unhelpfully here that "just possibly there was a contemporary English translation or adaptation [of Cinthio] which has disappeared."

The case advanced for the superiority of Q_1 (1622), on which Ridley has based his *Othello* text (though he does not give Q_1's title), is not wholly convincing. "Assuming . . . that the compositors were particularly careful with punctuation," he urges, "we are compelled to conclude that the MSS. from which the two texts [Q_1 and F] were set were markedly different in punctuation as in other things." (But he has suppressed salient evidence of Elizabethan printers' habits, outside the matter at hand, tending to prove otherwise.) He adduces as proofs of authorial pointing and phrasing in Q_1 "the famous three pages of *Sir Thomas More*" and the textual histories of Keats' *To Autumn* and *St. Agnes;* contends that "F exhibits a good deal of elaboration by Heminge and Condell"; and, noting the comparative "slightness of [F] stage-directions," proposes as Folio copy-text "a transcript for a reader, or . . . one for the theatre, at the discretion of the critic" (not, emphatically, a corrected specimen of Q_1). In the Preface, quite as serenely, he claims Q_2 (1630) to be "the first piece of Shakespearean editing where we can completely check the editor's operations." By so clogging our path toward the play, Ridley effectually diverts us into a bibliographical quagmire.

The introductory section on "The Play and the Characters" opens (not surprisingly) with a paraphrase of A. C. Bradley on *King Lear*, followed by a statement that the plot of *Othello* is simple: "A man, disappointed of promotion which he thought he had a right to expect, determines on revenge, and in part secures it." That Ridley should view "the plot" of *Othello* thus baldly in terms of Iago, rather than of Othello, is at one with his enjoining us to make our own comparison of the play with its source—he is too convinced a Coleridgeian to execute the editorial task in any other way. The abiding, if wry, rationalistic objections of Thomas Rymer (the first critic ever to check *Othello* against the *Hecatommithi*) are not even acknowledged here; yet a minor nineteenth-century commentator's suggestion that "Othello *was* a white man" is accorded an intense rejoinder:

One of the finest heads I have ever seen on

> any human being was that of a negro conductor on an American Pullman car. . . . He was coal-black, but he might have sat to a sculptor for a statue of Caesar, or, so far as appearance went, have played a superb Othello. . . . The modern reader, with Toussaint L'Ouverture and John Laputa in mind, is not likely to regard blackness of complexion, in fact or in fiction, as incompatible with high rank or blood royal.

And much the same sort of "criticism" (Ridley's term, again) is applied to Desdemona:

> She has, in her first pleading for Cassio, a child's innocent, though in the circumstances fatal, persistence. . . . In just this way a child tries to pin down a treat. "Can we go to the zoo this afternoon?" "No, not this afternoon, dear, I'm busy." "Tomorrow morning, then?" "Well, we'll see, but I think not." "Tomorrow afternoon?" "No, dear, I've got people coming in to tea."

Subjective to a fault, the editor ignores the significant fact that, whereas Cinthio's Moor had been of indeterminate color, Shakespeare deliberately made his protagonist dark-skinned; and that, before her first pleading for Cassio, Desdemona had defended her own conduct before the Senate in a most eloquent (and grown-up) manner. Ridley's is a Pullman-car Othello of the mind's eye, a hero whose actions never materialize in accordance with a physical stage or with sensitive regard to a living, responding audience.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.
Yale University

THEATRE WORLD: SEASON 1957-1958. By Daniel Blum. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1958; pp. 256; 606 plates. $6.00.

THEATRE WORLD ANNUAL (LONDON) NUMBER 8: A PICTORIAL REVIEW OF WEST END PRODUCTIONS WITH A RECORD OF PLAYS AND PLAYERS, 1956-1957. By Frances Stephens. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. 176; 305 plates. $5.00.

INTERNATIONAL THEATRE ANNUAL, No. 2. Edited by Harold Hobson. New York: Doubleday, 1957; pp. 220; 132 plates. $6.00.

Daniel Blum's New York calendar, Frances Stephens' London review, and Harold Hobson's international survey demonstrate popular methods of publishing current theatrical data.

For those who can't tell the players without a program, Mr. Blum's fourteenth New York annual (1957-1958) provides complete lists of casts, staffs, and dates as well as some 500 production shots. He records Broadway's mart yet expands his view to plays off-Broadway, New York City Center season, Phoenix Theatre season, national touring companies, and two Stratford Shakespearean festivals (Connecticut and Ontario). Omissions of dates (*West Side Story*) and names (cast replacements in *Look Homeward Angel*) seem rare—a matter of spacing or proofreading. Concise actors' biographies, obituaries, and index complete Blum's excellent pictorial survey.

Approximating Blum's New York calendar, Miss Stephens covers in pictures and statistics the 1956-1957 West End London season. Recording casts, staffs, and dates of some seventy productions, Miss Stephens' eighth annual provides more than playbills and pictures. She judiciously selects thirty-seven productions and exhibits each play as follows: the first page presents a critical summary, production statistics, and pictures; the remaining pages (from one to five, depending on significance) contain dramatic shots, and character-plot descriptions, in order of performance; in many instances, a few lines of dialogue accompany each picture. Thus, picture, plot, and dialogue blend to form an excellent visual and verbal play review. In addition to West End productions, Miss Stephens produces Old Vic, ballet, and opera photographs. She introduces Old Vic casts but unfortunately limits each production to one or two pictures. Ballet and opera, moreover, receive scant attention—only six pages.

Presenting twenty articles on the international scene (1956-1957), editor Hobson draws on three general resources: playwrights, directors, and critics. Playwrights John Osborne, Eugene Ionesco, and Sigmund Miller write briefly about themselves, while Elizabeth Montague—translator and adapter—reviews Viennese theatre. Directors are represented by Donald Wolfit's "Actor Managers," George Devine's "Royal Court Theatre," Henry Sherek's "Poetic Drama and Henry Sherek," Leslie French's "Vigour in South Africa," and Alan Schneider's "New York Season." Contributing the lion's share, dramatic critics and their subjects include H. Banning Richardson, Canada; J. W. Lambert, London; Gabriel Fallon, Ireland; Jean-Pierre Lenoir, Paris; Geoffrey Hutton, Australia; Cecil Wilson, British Musical Comedy; and Anthony Curtis, a significant paper entitled "Identity in the Italian Theatre." J. C. Trewin presents two

papers (English provincial theatre and the year's best English performances), while the editor provides an excellent review of Russian theatre. In the final article, "I Disagree," Mr. Hobson vigorously takes issue with—and the last word from—several of his contributors. With England the subject in nine of the twenty international papers (excluding articles on Canada, South Africa, and Australia), Mr. Hobson should either change the annual title or consider significant omissions for future volumes—Germany, the Baltic, Greece, South America, the Orient. Moreover, most of the dramatic photographs illustrate American or English productions and rarely relate to text.

Blum's calendar, Stephens' review, and Hobson's survey indicate that purpose and total plays determine the publishing method. Faced with numerous New York productions, and desiring complete coverage, Mr. Blum exhibits photographs and production lists. Fewer West End London productions enable Miss Stephens to engage in critical commentary—her method incorporates text with illustrations. The international scene limits Mr. Hobson to critical summaries interspersed with pictures. If each author, however, carefully examined the others' works, improved methods might result. For example, Blum's calendar would benefit by critical commentary, while Stephens' review suggests an extended coverage. Both might include selective articles by dramatic critics. In preparing pictures for his third volume, Mr. Hobson should employ abilities comparable to Mr. Blum's knack in selecting dramatic shots and Miss Stephens' talent for blending pictures with comments.

EUGENE K. BRISTOW
Indiana University

THE CATHEDRAL. By Clive Sansom. London: Methuen, 1958; pp. 118. 10s 6d.

THE WITNESSES AND OTHER POEMS. By Clive Sansom. London: Methuen, 1956; pp. 106. 8s 6d.

THE WORLD TURNED UPSIDE DOWN. By Clive Sansom. London: Frederick Muller, 1948; pp. 62. Paper 7s.

The publication of a new book of poems, *The Cathedral,* by Clive Sansom should be a matter of great interest to all who love poetry and most especially to all who teach oral interpretation. Mr. Sansom is not only a poet of unusual sensitivity to a wide range of human values, an acute analyst of character, and a master of both the vivid and the metrical aspects of wordcraft, but he is also a skilled communicator of moods and ideas. Having spent two weeks with him and his wife on their island home of Tasmania, I learned to appreciate the depth of the intelligent integrity with which he seeks to come to grips with the eternal verities of human relationships. Observing the devotion which he gives to his work of administering and developing speech activities in all the public schools of Tasmania, it is natural to think of him as a modern *trouvère*—a poet talking to people, in a language that will reach them, with a message that is truly his.

The World Turned Upside Down is a modern morality play based on the Christmas story, in which Science, Religion, False Science and False Religion discuss with other guests at the Inn (including Trade and Nationalism) the significance that might result from a genuine union of religion and science. Abstract as the theme is, Mr. Sansom brings his characters to life, imbues them with humor and emotional warmth, and builds a drama that quickly involves the reader because it deals with problems of urgency to us all.

The Witnesses are exquisite sketches, in varied verse forms, of thirty-four individuals closely connected in some manner with the crucifixion of Jesus. Somewhat colloquial and deceptively casual in tone, as though related by a sojourner in Biblical Palestine, these poems display a poetic imagination and a communicative skill that make them admirable for oral reading to varied audiences.

Mr. Sansom's new book, *The Cathedral,* is, like *The Witnesses,* the product of careful study of source data followed by a long nurturing period of "emotion recollected in tranquility." The poet, deeply moved by the sublimity of an English cathedral (particularly Salisbury), undertook to limn its significance in terms of its builders and of others associated with it through five centuries. In an unusual colloquy with his readers, Mr. Sansom closes this book with a series of notes indicating the sources of the factual data in the poems. But the real source of the poetry is the sensitive mind of the poet, who has seen much of life (crude, rude, and beautiful) and has synthesized it into a meaning with faith at its core.

For teachers looking for poetry that is genuine and that is attractive alike to seasoned *litterateurs* and to robust and relatively unlettered youth, these three books by our compatriot in speech are happily recommended.

They read well; they grow in the mind; and they will last.

ROBERT T. OLIVER
The Pennsylvania State University

LA NOUVELLE RHÉTORIQUE TRAITÉ DE L'ARGUMENTATION. By Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. Paris, France: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958; 2 Vols., pp. 734.

La Nouvelle Rhétorique by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca does not have a counterpart in contemporary American treatises on speech. Concerning itself with both rhetoric and dialectic, it attempts to restate the classical principles of argument in terms of our contemporary civilization.

After explaining that the term "rhetoric" was chosen for the title because of the way in which the term "dialectic" has been used since Hegel, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca explain that the scope of their study is the place of oral and written argument as it concerns the probable. The authors contend that dialectic since Descartes has been mainly concerned with scientific proof, taking evidence as the mark of reason. Must we conclude, they ask, that where induction and deduction give no solution, we must abandon ourselves to irrational forces, to our instincts, to suggestion or to violence?

The introduction makes clear that the approach to argument will be psychological, with the listener always considered as a part of any communication. Visual communication is considered only as it applies to oral communication. The authors have sought to clarify the characteristics of the diverse structures of argument which should *precede* experimentation and which do not lend themselves to the laboratory method of examination.

In pursuit of their attempt to modernize the ancient principles of rhetoric, the authors offer a two-volume, paperback treatise divided into three parts. The organization of each of these parts is not conventional, but it is certainly thought-provoking. It will be possible here to point out only the trend of each part, calling attention to special features under each.

The first part, entitled the bounds of argument, is mainly concerned with the relationships between the speaker and his audience. There is a section dealing with "La délibération avec soi-même," as well as discussions of the difference between persuading and convincing, education and propaganda, and argument and violence.

The second part involves audience analysis, discussing real and preferable approaches. The use of *topoi* is examined here. The section concludes with chapters on the choice of a subject and its presentation, discussing phases of invention, arrangement, and style.

Part III begins with a discussion of quasi-logical arguments, which range from the position of ridicule to argument by reciprocity. There follow discussions of the means versus the end, *L'argument du gaspillage* (since we have gone this far, we would be wasting effort to turn back), the analogy, the effect of arrangement on persuasion, and other aspects of communication. There is an extensive bibliography.

The extent of the contribution might have been enhanced by a more conventional format. Perhaps the attempt to avoid discussions of inductive and deductive reasoning *per se* led to difficult transitions. The five canons of rhetoric might have served as convenient groupings for the material. However, the continual awareness of the position of the audience in any argument may have required a new type of format. As the material now exists, however, the reader cannot but feel somewhat confused at finding, for example, the fallacies of *argumentum ad hominem* and "le ridicule, et son rôle dans l'argumentation" (both *ignoratio elenchi*) discussed not together but under separate sections. Although such names as Hovland, Lasswell, and Lund appear in the bibliography, there are many places where a more intimate acquaintance with contemporary research in this country would have added materially.

Certainly the 734 pages of *La Nouvelle Rhétorique* should find an immediate place in classroom bibliographies on argument and should serve as admirable material for gaining a perspective on contemporary argument.

PAUL D. BRANDES
Ohio University

AMERICAN STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES, A SURVEY OF COLLEGE PROGRAMS. By Robert H. Walker. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958; pp. 210. Paper $3.00.

This book reports on American studies activities in collegiate institutions of the United States. It is based upon three "main ingredients": (1) descriptive essays pertaining to each program, (2) questionnaires and statistics drawn therefrom, (3) the opinions of the leaders expressed at a conference held in Washington, D. C., March 1957. The research is the work of committees of The American Studies Association.

The first two-thirds of the book is a directory in which ninety-five "active courses and/or programs" are described and evaluated in one-to-two-page essays under the following subheadings: administrative, undergraduate program, undergraduate courses, graduate program, graduate courses, and comment. The last third of the book presents a summary, analysis, and evaluation of the movement as a whole.

The study gives an excellent overview of this interdisciplinary and interdepartmental emphasis which has found a place on about one in twenty campuses. Over half of these (51 out of 95) are found in states along the Atlantic seaboard. Seventy-two schools now grant the B.A. in American studies; six of these give the M.A. as well as the B.A.; three award the B.A. and the Ph.D.; nine give the three degrees. One offers only the Ph.D.

Although it dates back to the twenties, the movement has received its greatest impetus since World War II. Departments of history and literature have most often initiated programs. Departments of political science, philosophy and religion, sociology, and fine arts have sometimes assisted in launching programs. In three instances departments of speech and drama have cooperated.

Sharing the goals of general education, American studies attempt to give students an understanding and an appreciation of American thought, character, and institutions. Most often required are history and literature. Lagging significantly behind as requirements are philosophy, foreign history or civilization, political science, art, sociology, economics, religion, and social science. Speech is occasionally included. The author concludes that, as a whole, the movement is headed "in direction of a history-social science orientation rather than in a literature-fine arts direction."

This book, produced by offset and bound in a paper cover, is comprehensive and well done. It is recommended to those interested in college curriculum developments.

WALDO W. BRADEN
Louisiana State University

EVALUATION IN THE BASIC COLLEGE AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY. Edited by Paul L. Dressel. New York: Harper, 1958; viii+248. $4.00.

The Basic College at Michigan State University is the administrative unit responsible for the educational program of the first two years. The book reports something of the soul searching, the planning, the projects undertaken, and the special studies carried on to develop a program in general education. Questions are asked which thoughtful educators are asking in many places. There is much that educators elsewhere should find clarifying and useful.

The book has fifteen chapters, a preface, and an appropriate index. The major content of the report consists of research findings and the evaluations of students and programs in light of these findings. It is refreshing to find here the thinking of administrators who find statistical studies useful for something more than reporting enrollment. Limitations, qualifications, alternatives considered, and failures are set forth with candor. This approach to college teaching and administration has not prevented a thoughtful and creative approach to education. Although research findings cannot always be put to immediate use, the spirit and tone of this volume suggest that the educators in the program believe that it is more fun to know than to guess.

Some typical quotations include: "Student responses to these questions indicate a dominant interest in curricula that will provide vocational training" (p. 43), and "Factual data and statistics . . . occasionally . . . may even drive home the point to a faculty member that students at a midwest state university are not altogether like those in more selective institutions" (p. 45). "We are learning from the study that there are fewer students who progress as conventionally expected than we would have guessed" (p. 69). On the matter of examinations: "We do better at talking about thinking . . . than we do at making students realize that this is an objective" (p. 94). On grades: "The best predictor of grade point averages is the reading test" (p. 105). "Grades cannot be used to enforce standards which are not defined in terms meaningful to both students and instructors" (p. 151). We note that "teachers who turn their attention to the task can increase the amount of thinking done by students" (p. 209).

Research reports are documented for the scholar interested in more thorough analysis. Each chapter is concluded by a summary which reviews and interprets major points of content.

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER
The Ohio State University

THE PHONETIC WRITINGS OF ROBERT ROBINSON. Edited by E. J. Dobson. Early English Text Society, No. 238. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957; pp. xxii+95. $4.50.

The book reproduced here, pp. 1-28, is *The Art of Pronuntiation*, London, 1617, unique

copy in the Bodleian rediscovered by H. G. Fiedler in 1919 and brought to the attention of philologists in articles by Fiedler, Dobson, and David Abercrombie, 1936-1948, and in Dobson's *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*, 1957, all noted in the Introduction. The manuscripts, here pp. 29-72 and earlier noted by Dobson and Abercrombie, are phonetic transcriptions of extended texts, presumably made shortly after 1617. There is a word index.

We are enormously indebted to Dr. Dobson and the Early English Text Society for making available what seems to be the first English work in phonetics not in the slightest contaminated by a notion of spelling reform. The introductory editorial comment is supplementary to what Dobson has written elsewhere. The text of *The Art* leaves nothing to be desired and needs no comment. The transcription is excellently accurate if one accepts Dobson's plan for converting the unprintable, and if printable still painful, symbolization into something readily readable. A check of one line per page against photostats at the University of Edinburgh turns up only one lapse from fidelity to text, omission of a comma. The plan for converting does not, however, have to be accepted with enthusiasm.

Dobson avoids IPA symbols on the ground that their use "inevitably forces a definite interpretation on the original symbols for which there may be no warrant at all." The result is, of course, that the reader is put to some bother and is no less likely to interpret definitely. More damping to enthusiasm is Dobson's reversal of Robinson's graphic emphasis. Dobson uses same symbols for short and long vowels, the latter conspicuous with macrons and circumflex; Robinson has different symbols of the same size. Dobson uses different symbols for consonants of what he calls voiceless-voiced pairs; Robinson has same symbols with a conspicuous marker for the one of the pair he calls aspirated. Add Dobson's frequent corrections, with Robinson reduced to footnotes, and what we have prominently displayed is Dobson's conventional and diachronically conditioned phonetic theory, not what Robinson would have had printed.

The work is interesting as evidence for the English of its day; it is exciting for its aggressively synchronic and highly sophisticated, if not impeccable, phonetic analysis. Perhaps it can be made the subject of a dissertation by someone who is not afraid to consider the possibility that [b] + y=[p] may make just as much sense as [p] + x=[b].

LEE S. HULTZÉN
University of Edinburgh

HAWAIIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. By Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert. Honolulu: University Press, 1957; pp. xxx+361. $15.00.

For almost a decade this reviewer has observed, and sometimes made use of, the increasing thousands of word-cards in the files of Dr. Samuel H. Elbert, Associate Professor of Pacific Languages in the University of Hawaii in Honolulu. The reviewer has watched Mary Kawena Pukui, Associate in Hawaiian Culture, Bishop Museum, transcribing from tapes the data for more and more cards. Now the magnificent completed work of these skillful, informed modern lexicographers stands as a monument to their scholarship, dedication, and devotion.

This Hawaiian-English Dictionary is the tenth since 1820, when the missionaries arrived. It is the largest (25,000 words), best—and last, considering the dwindling number who speak Hawaiian. But as a source-book it will stimulate further publications on Proto-Polynesian (PPN) and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP), following those by Dempwolff, Dyen, and Elbert, as well as supplementary studies, lexical and syntactic, suggested within the text.

The concept of arranging the collected words is new. Since many a Hawaiian word serves indifferently for several of what have conventionally been called parts of speech, the *Dictionary* lists meanings without categorizing them as parts of speech. E.g., *hau* means (1) a tree; (2) cool, iced, ice, frost, dew, snow, cool breeze, blow with coolness; (3) hit, smite, tap; (4) lay before, offer; (5) a porous stone. Relation to PPN **fau* and PMP **baRu* is here indicated. But the book, though employing new nomenclature freely where necessary, avoids change for its own sake; it uses conventional names for parts of speech where appropriate.

A Hawaiian word often sustains intricate relationships with many other words. Word entries in the *Dictionary*, therefore, include much cross-referencing. Moreover, each entry is related explicitly or implicitly to some nine pages (pp. xv-xxiii) which constitute a complete Hawaiian grammar. This *sui generis* grammar, foreshadowed in Elbert's *Conversational Hawaiian* (University of Hawaii, 1951), abjures most Latin-Greek patterns as having little application to a non-Indo-European language. The unique character of Hawaiian, and the sanity

of the grammar, show in the following entries abstracted from the text.

WORDS

Minor words. Pronouns, demonstratives, possessives.
Numerals.
Interjections.
Major words.

PARTICLES

Substantive markers of case. 'O, i (iā), *a, me, ma, mai* (mai iā), *e* (voc.), *e* (by), and the possessive markers *o, a, no, na.*

Plural markers. Na, mau.

Verb markers of aspect, mood and tense. Completed aspect, state or condition. *Ua, ke; i; i*+vb.+*ai.*

Incompleted aspect/future tense. *E*+vb.+*ana; e; e*+vb.+*ai; e*+vb.+*ana* (nei, la, āla).

Imperative/exhortative mood. *E, o, mai; i, o, ke, e.*

Present progressive aspect/tense. *Ke*+vb.+*nei* (la, ala); e+vb.+ana (nei, la, ala).

Conjunctions. a, 'ae, āhea, akā, 'a'ole, i, inā,ināhea, ōiai.

Nondetermining particles after words. Pu; wale, 'ia, 'ana; mai, aku, a'e, iho; nei, na, la, ala, ai; no, la, na'e, ho'i, e, anei, paha.

PROCESSES

Prefixing, suffixing, compounding reduplication, lengthening.

SENTENCES

Order within a phrase; function and order of phrases.

The foregoing suggests what the problems of Hawaiian are like. Particles present the outstanding problem of strict word order. A particle stands in fixed position *before* a modified word or *after* it. Major and minor words themselves stand in relatively strict order. The *Dictionary* and the grammar organize all this complexity of positioning for ready comprehension. Illustrative sentences in authentic Hawaiian greatly facilitate learning.

Another problem arises from the sparseness of Hawaiian sounds. There are only thirteen phonemes, viz., /i/, /e/, /a/, /o/, /u/; /h/, /k/, /l/, /m/, /n/, /p/, /w/, /ʔ/. These recur endlessly. Though pleasantly melodic, the repetitions are difficult to keep separately in mind. Consider *kila* (high place), *kilakila* (majestic), *kili* (raindrops), *kilihune* (light rain), *kilihunehune* (spray); *malama* (light), *ho'omalamalama* (to cause light); *lala* (diagonal), *lale* (to hasten), *lali* (greasy), *lalo* (down). *Dictionary* and grammar combine to avert confusion. Throughout, the grammar adds depth to the spacious concept of the *Dictionary*.

To students and scholars: *He maika'i keia puke wehewehe 'olelo Hawai'i-Enelani.* To the authors: *Mahalo, mahalo nui loa!*

C. M. WISE
Louisiana State University

LANGUAGE, THOUGHT, AND CULTURE. By Roger W. Brown, Irving M. Copi, Don E. Dulaney, William K. Frankena, Paul Henle, Charles L. Stevenson. Edited by Paul Henle. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958; pp. viii+ 273. $4.95.

THE HUMANITY OF WORDS. By Bess Sondel. New York: World Publishing Co., 1958; pp. 245. $4.00.

THE FIELD THEORY OF MEANING. By Andrew Paul Ushenko. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958; pp. xxii+182. $4.75.

It is not scanting the very real merits of these books to suggest that they portend more than they accomplish. Each is, in its way, a part for the plinth of a satisfactory science of human behavior, using the curious significance of communication as an organizing principle. The caravan is still in the desert, but the "Royame of Perse" is in sight!

It is surely disheartening to know our substantial accomplishments in the science of understanding man—significantly so real and possible for helping men to realize themselves and their dearest anticipations—yet to know also that this knowledge is hardly known to those who might apply it. While minimizing neither our appalling and drab language, nor our frequent trumpetings of the apparent, recent contributions in the behavioral sciences are unquestionably as significant as those of the natural sciences but enjoy no comparable understanding or employment.

The present works contribute further to a synthesis which may alter this poignant circumstance. Each recognizes the notion that, at least in man (and very probably not in man alone), a communicative system seems to anticipate action. This system we understand only vaguely. We don't know, for example, whether it is a model *for* or *of* seemingly basic processes. Our tools for its analysis are still clumsy as hand-hewn flints: we still rely strongly on analogy and metaphor and use description and patterning only hesitantly. Still, what is truly at stake is becoming appar-

ent: our unifying principle is one of systematic, structured, communicative interaction; our model, for a number of reasons, the diverse phenomena of languages and meta-languages.

The late Professor Ushenko, a professional philosopher, treats the problem of meaning in its relation to perception and logic. Analogizing the physical vector field, he attempts to establish a contextual basis for meaning in which "*belief, generality* and *predication of existence* are three terms for . . . the same thing . . . the part of the referent in the existence proposition." He accepts De Quincey's division: the "literature of knowledge" and the "literature of power" (the function of the one, to teach; of the other, to move).

Ushenko's philosophy awaits the professionals' alembics; the linguist, though interested, must reserve judgment. The De Quinceyan distinction is questionable and while a contextual approach is sound, meaning is surely more imbedded in linguistic structures (which are notoriously diverse) than Ushenko allows.

Dr. Sondel's book, subtitled *A Primer Of Semantics,* is essentially a text with the inexorable textbook drawbacks: too much and too little. A concise and admirable summary of the theories of Ogden and Richards, Korzybski, and Charles Morris (in a handsome and pedagogically thoughtful typography), it also presents her own Field Theory of Communication (the analogy now at second remove, based on the psychologists' field theory of personality).

The title clues a failing: words, *per se,* even as semantic meaning-tokens, are the small change of speech. Their organization, morphologically, and, even more importantly, syntactically, as well as "suprasegmental" features, should, by now, occupy more space in semantic theory. Too, for historical reasons, and for completeness, there might be mention of other theories and contributors to semantic doctrine.

But these are cavils. Many of us are cordially going to find "Sondel" a fine book to work with, and many students will be grateful to it.

Henle's symposium deserves much more extended comment. The product of a year's discussion, it is sharp, provocative, stimulating, withal suffering the absence of conceptual unity inherent in all such books. It is, nonetheless, extremely seminal: one wishes to argue its concepts, not its contents. The chapters on "Language, Thought and Culture," on "Artificial Languages," on symbolism in representative and non-representative arts encourage the reader to rewrite, controvert, add, subtract, disprove. In short, a most healthy book, not least for those not presently engaged in this kind of study.

In all of these books, whether mentioned or no, we find the ideas of Sapir and Whorf looming large, and the promise of fertile syntheses. Yet, for all their challenging hypotheses, few research principles and even fewer research designs emerge. We must now, I think, consider moving further from reasoning to demonstration, as in Kenneth Pike's effort to push the "-emic" technique upwards as a unifying method for all behavioral studies. One need accept neither the "behavioreme" nor Pike's anticipated outcome to encourage this type of methodological approach.

There is special import for the "field of speech" in all of this. The speech teacher is at once popularizer, synthesizer, analyst and manipulator of the basic stuff at the bottom of the Saussurean hierarchy, the necessary *parole.*

His rôle in general and in this unification is, therefore, expanding significantly and overwhelmingly. These books will surely help him, then, in freshly re-interpreting it.

WILLIAM KAY ARCHER
Hunter College in the Bronx

READINGS IN APPLIED ENGLISH LINGUISTICS. Edited by Harold B. Allen. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958; pp. xiv+428. Paper $3.75.

The relatively new discipline of linguistics and the application of linguistic principles to the English language have led to the publication of many excellent articles in widely-scattered periodicals. These studies have added much to our knowledge of the history and structure of our language, and many challenge long-accepted beliefs. The "cultural lag" between traditional views and the recent findings of linguistic science should disturb all teachers of language. This collection of articles, planned for the undergraduate major in English and for those planning to teach English, will do much to narrow the gap.

Sixty-five recently published articles, all within the framework of modern linguistics (only six were published before 1950), appear in this well-printed collection. The book is divided into seven Parts: I The Historical Background (3 articles); II Linguistics Today (14); III Linguistic Geography (9); IV Linguistics and Usage (17); V Linguistics and the Teaching of Grammar and Composition (13); VI Linguistics and the Dictionary (4); VII Linguistics and the Study of Literature (5). Most originally appeared in *College English* (7), *American Speech* (12),

College Composition and Communication (9), and *Language Learning* (6). Four are former *QJS* articles. Of special interest to students of speech are: Hill's "Linguistics Since Bloomfield"; "Science and Linguistics" by Whorf, which discusses how words and customs affect reasoning; three articles by George Faust, which describe the basic tenets of structural linguistics, phonemics, and morphemics; a short note by Dwight Bolinger on how intonation alters meaning; one by A. H. Marckwardt on linguistic geography, which iterates the need for a body of facts to put some of our impressionistic judgments to the test; Allen's description of the *Atlas* contributions which make obsolete our "three-dialect division" of Eastern, Southern, and Northern; McDavid's "Some Social Differences in Pronunciation," which points out that certain pronunciations may lack prestige in one area but be acceptable in another, like [sʌt] and [kɛtʃ] for *soot* and *catch;* Kenyon's "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties," which shows that each cultural level, including nonstandard, contains formal and informal usages; and Seymour Chatman's "Linguistics and Teaching Introductory Literature," an application of the Trager-Smith principles to the teaching of literature.

No collection of articles will please everyone. Some will object to certain duplications; others will miss contributions by Hubbell, Hultzén, Thomas, Pike, Kurath, and Trager. Still others will want articles disagreeing with some positions in this collection. But all such complaint would be quibbling. This collection is a fine addition to the English and speech undergraduate students' text and reading lists.

ARTHUR J. BRONSTEIN
Queens College

THE IMPROVEMENT OF VOICE AND DICTION. By Jon Eisenson. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 303. $4.75.

This textbook is written for two kinds of students—those with a strong interest in speech and speaking, and those who are not self-motivated to study and improve their voice and diction.

The author develops the basic assumption that intelligent human beings want to have some body of information about skills they are expected to acquire. Intelligent persons tend to have curiosity; they want to know something of the *what* as well as the *how* of activities they are expected to undertake.

The book is divided into two parts: Voice and Diction. There are several objectives of the first part: to create awareness of what constitutes an effective voice; to indicate how voice can be produced and controlled so that common faults are overcome or avoided; to suggest how voice can be improved as an instrument of communication.

Factors essential to effective vocalization are discussed, as well as the mechanism of speech, breathing, and phonation. The illustrations are clear and to-the-point.

In discussing breathing for effective vocalization, the author points out that inappropriate force, wrong pitch, and incorrect breathing can be the cause of vocal disorders. Exercises for control of abdominal action in breathing and for abdominal breathing and phrasing are included.

Exercises for developing readiness to vocalize, overcoming glottal attack, developing adequate loudness, controlling loudness, strengthening the weak voice, oral resonance, and nasal resonance are included in chapters on Production of Clear Tones, Making Yourself Heard, Reinforcement of Tone Through Resonance, and Pitch and Voice Improvement. Chapters on Duration and Vocal Variety include selections for drill.

The second part of the book has two related purposes—to provide specific information about the sounds of our language and practice materials for each of the sounds. No attempt is made to be prescriptive or to advocate any one standard of diction as better or more desirable than another. Forty distinctive sounds or *phonemes* are used. There are some variants in them in different parts of the country.

Instructions are given in a personalized fashion, rather than a trite academic manner; for example, "If you concentrate on the vowel sounds of the words *me* and *moo* you should be able to note that the blade of the tongue moves forward toward the hard palate for *me*. For *moo*, the back of the tongue moves toward the soft palate." Another such example is, "You may test these representative tongue positions with your own articulatory behavior." As practice materials words are given in initial, medial, and final positions. There are sentences of varying lengths and types, including questions.

For persons who have difficulty in distinguishing between two similar or commonly mistaken sounds, as the tense vowel [i] and the relaxed [ɪ], practice material given shows the difference in production of the sound with words which can be said to illustrate the sounds which are being stressed.

A special case in point is the compromise

vowel [a] which is used by a minority of American speakers, most of whom probably reside in the New England area and use the sound in words like *ask, grass,* and *mash.*

Similarly the vowel [ɒ] is used by some Americans in words in which [ɑ] is used by others. It is also used as a variant for the vowel [ɔ] as in *dog* and *cough.*

Since this sound is not used consistently throughout the country, no list of words is given.

Diphthongs [ɛə] in such words as *hair, their, forbear,* are given, with the exception that speakers who pronounce their *r's* are likely to use the combination [ɛr] or [ɛɚ] rather than [ɛə]. The same is true of [ɪə] and [ɪr] or [ɪɚ].

Consonants are grouped as labials, labiodentals, lingna-alveolar, glottal, and those made with tongue and hard or soft palate. Diagrams of tongue, lip, and tooth positions are given.

The phoneme [r] is called the "vowel-like sound [r]." The author states that there is considerable variation in the production and pronunciation of this sound according to context and regional practice.

In general, this is a good handbook for students and instructors. It contains descriptions and techniques—the *"how,"* with exercises—the *"what,"* leading to good voice and diction.

ALFRED J. SOKOLNICKI
Marquette University

TELEVISION: TECHNIQUES FOR PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE. By Samuel L. Becker and H. Clay Harshbarger. New York: Henry Holt, 1958; pp. x+182. $3.00.

This text has the clearly defined purpose of assisting the student in the development of effective television speech. The authors observe that speaking on television is not different in kind from any speech situation. However, the effective translation of sound speech fundamentals to television depends, in large degree, upon a proper adaptation to and use of the medium. The text concentrates on this aspect of the communication process.

Opening chapters briefly discuss "Television and the Communication Process" and "The Television Team." The third chapter presents a sequence of twenty performance assignments interestingly conceived and designed to introduce the student to the complexities of television performance. Assignment subjects range from the short speech using no "visuals" and a one-camera pick up, through pantomimes, persuasive speeches utilizing visual aids, discussions, weather programs, two-camera demonstrations, children's programs, to the fully realized television production of entertainment, educational, and documentary programs.

Into each performance assignment is blended the right proportion of television production information designed to be of immediate value in the specific assignment. Thus, when the student gets his first two-camera assignment, he is concurrently introduced to certain of the functions of the floor manager and to the language of camera and time signals. Each assignment concludes with brief criteria for evaluating the performance.

The remaining chapters of the text detail certain of the basic concepts of adapting speech to television. Chapter topics include using scripts, movement and communication, pronunciation and voice, costume and make-up, audio, lighting, and the television lens. This latter chapter is of special importance. Here the authors have treated a sometimes confusing and complicated subject with a clarity the student will appreciate.

This entire work is written with the economy of directness and simplicity. It is illustrated with a few well executed line drawings, charts, and floor plans. There is no collection of full-page pictures of network production studios or shows-in-progress. The book doesn't suffer by their absence, and we all benefit by being able to purchase the text at a reasonable price.

Here in published form is an excellent course in television speech.

JOHN P. HIGHLANDER
University of Michigan

BROADCASTING IN AUSTRALIA. By Ian K. Mackay. Melbourne University Press; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1957; pp. 216. $5.00.

Australian radio is an interesting compromise between the British and American systems of broadcasting. There are regular commercial stations and networks (limited by federal law to a maximum of eight stations), and a Commonwealth Government-supported Australian Broadcasting Commission system. This arrangement appears to work most satisfactorily and there has been no suggestion that it should be abolished or even modified. In fact, Mr. Mackay, who is production manager for the commercial Macquarie Network, feels that it is ideal for Australia's radio needs, which are somewhat atypical: half the country's population is gathered in six capital cities; the rest is scattered throughout the huge continent. It

is apparent, then, that commercially-supported stations would find the economics of broadcasting to remote towns and settlements impracticable.

It was this very matter of population distribution that brought the Federal Government into broadcasting. After radio was initiated in Sydney on November 23, 1923, there were many newspaper and retailing companies willing to start transmitting. But they failed to broadcast to outlying areas. The government felt that it was in the national interest to compel country coverage. Several stations were in financial difficulties. The government bought up a group of stations and called for tenders to operate them on contract for the period 1929-32. A combine, called the Australian Broadcasting Company, operated the infant "system" until the Australian Broadcasting Commission began transmission in July 1932. The Commission is financed by both government appropriation and the income from an annual listener's fee levied on all owners of radios. It now operates 53 of the 160 medium-wave stations in Australia and broadcasts through two networks: the Interstate Program provides light, popular music, sports and comedy shows; the National Program features classical music, lectures, educational broadcasts, and direct broadcasts of federal parliamentary debates.

The A.B.C. has aided music in Australia: it organized the first symphony orchestra in 1934 and now manages six, with a total of 42,000 subscribers—although all concerts are broadcast.

Mr. Mackay feels that the A.B.C. could have done more for radio drama; that the system whereby the Post Office controls the Commission's technical branch is unsatisfactory; that the A.B.C.'s independent news and sporting services are unexcelled; that parliamentary broadcasts should be truncated in the interests of better programming.

The Australian commercial stations are operated by labor unions, church councils, newspapers, retail stores, and small networks. They leave the elevation of public taste to the A.B.C. and restrict their offerings to light entertainment.

The style of the book is somewhat laborious and the author frequently provides details in secretarial style while failing to dramatize the main and important issues. There is not an anecdote: radio is one industry where there is always a plethora of them!

Government and commercial radio appear to work very well together in Australia, and it should, perhaps, be remembered that it was the shortcomings of commercial broadcasters that brought about government participation.

A. L. McLeod
State University of New York, Fredonia

SPEAKING FOR RESULTS: A GUIDE FOR BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKERS. By Ralph A. Micken. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958; pp. xiv+209. $2.75.

Professor Micken's first sentences declare that the volume's intention is "to be practical," its assumption is "that the usefulness of speech is immediate," its point of view is "that there is nothing to be ashamed of in speaking for results," and its audience is "the busy people in America who sell, promote, plan, and build."

Certainly readers will find the brief book, with its sprightly second person approach, among the most attractive of its kind. The sensible organization, amusing and pithy chapter sub-headings, conversational language, attractive make-up, and delightful cartoons promise popularity. Indeed, that promise will cause misgivings among the more conservative members of our profession. While most of the precepts are familiar and traditional, some few will occasion surprise and disagreement.

Condoning profanity, even with mild reservations (pp. 45-47), is not usual. To justify it with the observation that a hammered thumb calls for something stronger than "Good gracious" seems inadequate; almost no one wields a hammer while making a public speech.

Proscribing manuscripts (pp. 49-51) is not customary. After rebutting the standard justifications for their use, Professor Micken says, "Avoid . . . manuscripts whenever it is legally permissible in speech situations."

A third instance of novelty occurs in the injunction (p. 109), "Formal [figurative] analogies should always be delivered with a smile." While most will agree with the author that a smile would have been appropriate when Lincoln commented on swapping horses in midstream, they would argue the suitability of that expression, for instance, in Lincoln's observations on Blondin and the Civil War government.

The final section, "Typical Speech Situations," deserves widespread examination. In fifteen parts, each concerned with a different speech problem, Professor Micken first defines the occasion, the desired response, and the methods; then lists a few "don'ts"; and finally presents a sample speech. Marginal notes in the

author's usual lively style comprise a most instructive developmental analysis.

The volume deserves consideration by any teacher scheduling a course for business or professional men.

ROBERT P. FRIEDMAN
University of Missouri

SPEECH PRACTICES: A RESOURCE BOOK FOR THE STUDENT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Waldo W. Braden and Mary Louise Gehring. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. viii+168. $3.00.

One of the persistent problems confronting the teacher of the beginning course in speech is that of finding samples of speaking which the student is able to associate with his own capabilities. The "model" utterances of great speakers appear to the beginning speaker to be out of reach, to be unrealistic. This fact has led many of us to spend hours typing out student speeches to be mimeographed and used as examples of what other students might be expected to accomplish in the course. No longer does this problem persist.

The authors of *Speech Practices* state as their purpose, "to provide through examples and testimony a collection of practical speech materials which will lead the student to a better understanding of the elements of speech composition and speech criticism." For the successful achievement of this end they have incorporated into the text numerous student speeches and speeches of contemporary Americans. Utilizing a case study approach, the speeches or excerpts are presented, followed by a series of questions aimed at extracting the principles of speechmaking under consideration. This type of organization is unique to speech texts.

Rather than proliferating the chapters, Braden and Gehring have divided their text into eight well defined divisions, each serving as an instructional unit. The chapters deal with the nature of speech criticism, speech preparation, organization, audience adaptation, supporting materials, style, types of speeches, and the method of speech criticism.

In addition to the instructional portions of the text, there are two features that aid the instructor. Following each of the chapters is a list of references from existing standard texts in public speaking which coordinate with the chapter in *Speech Practices*. Although this feature is particularly helpful in developing a course plan in which *Speech Practices* is used as the basic text with supplemental readings from several other texts, it is also an aid to the teacher in preparing a course plan in which *Speech Practices* is used as supplemental reading with another basic text. A second service feature is the selected reading lists on rhetoric and speech criticism for advanced students which follow the first and last chapters.

The fine selection of sample speeches and the case study approach to teaching speech principles make *Speech Practices* something more than just another textbook. It is unique and practical; a real contribution toward the more effective teaching of the beginning public speaking course.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
University of Virginia

HANDLING BARRIERS IN COMMUNICATION: LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS AND CONFEREE'S HANDBOOK. By Irving J. Lee and Laura L. Lee. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xviii+149+60. $5.00.

It has been almost twenty years since Irving J. Lee published his first book, *Language Habits in Human Affairs*. Dealing with general semantics and its use for clear and valid communication, it was an immediate and lasting success. At regular intervals thereafter, other volumes explaining and utilizing formulations from the discipline came from his pen. *Handling Barriers in Communication*, a posthumous work, gathered, refined, and collated by his wife Laura L. Lee, is the latest in this formidable array.

The book contains two sections: the "Lecture-Discussions," really a teacher's manual, and the "Conferee's Handbook," available also in separate format, primarily for students. The volume is the result of a lecture-discussion course given by Dr. Lee in 1955 to a group of employees of the Illinois Bell Telephone Company. The main objective of the course was to improve communications and relationships between subordinates and supervisors of that organization.

Organized on a meeting basis, the book suggests the short course of eight weeks. Within its compass such stereotypes as "The Person Who Jumps To Conclusions," "The Person Who Closes His Mind," and "The Person Who Listens Only To Words," form the basis for the employment of general semantic principles operating within the framework of the case method. This first half is the most useful for the neophyte interested in clarity of communication.

Much more specifically keyed to the employee in business and industry is the latter half of

the work comprising such topics for class meetings as "Making Assignments" and "Making Corrections." Here the cases are the kind that serve as effective stimulation to the analysis and resolution of communications problems by the embryonic supervisor. The cases range from those written by students, and excerpts from articles by business tycoons like Charles F. Kettering, to delineations of life-like situations by such a prominent figure in language and culture as B. L. Whorf. They illustrate the complexity of the communications act and serve as admirable material for the subsequent discussions of actual communications difficulties.

Laura L. Lee's hope that "the ideas presented . . . may offer some help in handling the barriers to communication" has largely been realized in the book. Simple in format, lucid in exposition, conversational in style, *Handling Barriers in Communication* has special value for the inexperienced instructor teaching the short course in "Business Communication," or "Conference Methods," where its practical applications have formidable appeal.

ANTHONY HILLBRUNER
Los Angeles State College

BRIEFLY NOTED

MARK TWAIN: SOCIAL CRITIC. By Philip S. Foner. New York: International Publishers, 1958; pp. 335. $4.50.

Philip S. Foner in *Mark Twain: Social Critic* explores a world of Mark Twain which is little remembered and even less understood by those who profess to know him. The book begins with a brief portrait, one of the best short biographies of Mark Twain ever written. To discuss Mark Twain as a social critic it is necessary to establish the fact that he was far more than a humorist. Dr. Foner first examines the continuing debate on this point which reached its height with Van Wyck Brooks' *The Ordeal of Mark Twain* and Bernard De Voto's *Mark Twain's America*. Second, in the major portion of the book, he discusses in detail Mark Twain's stand on the large social issues of his time. He reviews and presents portions of Mark Twain's writings and public utterances on politics, government, religion, capital and labor, the brotherhood of man, and imperialism.

The comprehensive scholarship of the work does not intrude itself into the writing. The result: the book is first of all easily readable. The followers of Mark Twain will want to read this book for the new insight it gives into America's foremost literary figure. Others who deal with great social issues, will find *Mark Twain: Social Critic* a useful as well as delightful volume. Mark Twain couldn't write even the severest criticism without the devastating power of his humor in evidence. The book leads the reader to conclude with Dr. Foner: "Mark Twain was our greatest social critic. As such he speaks to us with an immediacy that surmounts the barriers of time."

STANLEY T. DONNER
Stanford University

COSTUMING FOR THE MODERN STAGE. By Laura Zirner. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957; pp. 50. $3.00.

This striking handbook by Mrs. Zirner, based on her rich experience in theatrical costuming, will be welcomed by any theatre group interested in combining effectiveness and economy. In a visually fascinating format as appealing as an expertly designed display ad, the author presents her concept of "convertible costumes" assembled at will from eight basic units: (1) blouse, (2) bodice, (3) skirt, (4) tunic, (5) shirt, (6) pantaloons—long and short, (7) trousers, and (8) pants. Through various combinations of these units, costumes may be adapted to the character and mood of productions, giving an "impressionistic rather than realistic interpretation of period, locale, and style."

Simplified specifications for measuring and clear-cut directions for making the units are understood readily. Color charts portraying the significance of color combinations and drawings depicting each unit and illustrating some of the processes add a pictorial clarity which characterizes the entire book.

Trimming-units are treated as vividly as basic units. Multiple uses of circles, or portions of circles, range from jabots, collars, and headgear to jacket-peplums, capes, and overskirts. Although practical suggestions are offered for handling costume accessories, the tendency to stress *simplicity* takes precedence over any attempt to cover completely a phase as broad and as immune to categorizing as "costume extras."

EDNA WEST
Northwestern State College of Louisiana

W. B. YEATS AND TRADITION. By F. A. C. Wilson. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 286. $5.00.

The tradition in Mr. Wilson's perceptive study of Yeats's learning is Neoplatonism and,

by extension, less orthodox varieties of mystical philosophy. Particularly the shaping spirit of this tradition is traced through the poet's last five difficult plays and a group of related lyrics. An admittedly sympathetic attitude toward Neoplatonism enlivens Mr. Wilson's scholarship at every turn without diminishing his authority. An equally frank antipathy for the New Criticism motivates his work tendentiously, and this bias has already occasioned sharp comment here and abroad. Mr. Wilson believes the New Critics have misunderstood Yeats because they have neglected from principle the "ulterior body of knowledge" upon which the meaning of his poetry depends. He assumes a critic's right to dispose of meanings before nice consideration of the poetry as poetry. Inevitably his procedure will appear justifiable or naïve according to a reader's sense of the relationship between meaning and poetry. But beyond question, certainly, is the great usefulness of Mr. Wilson's patient and thorough reconstruction of Yeats's philosophical beliefs.

ANDREW G. HOOVER
Oberlin College

GEORGE MOORE. LETTERS TO LADY CUNARD, 1895-1933. Edited by Rupert Hart-Davis. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 208. $5.50.

George Moore (1853-1933), the Anglo-Irish writer whose best known works are *The Brook Kerith*, a moving story of Christ, and *Héloïse and Abélard*, a novel about the medieval lovers, has not received, in recent years, the attention he merits. This valuable collection of letters, ably and intelligently edited by Mr. Hart-Davis, brings a great deal to former critical and biographical studies, since it adds an intimate and important autobiographical dimension to the study of Moore.

Maud Cunard (1873-1948) is here revealed as the love of Moore's life. Twenty years younger than Moore, and married to a member of the shipping family, this American-born woman was, in addition to being a famous hostess earlier in the century, a generous patroness of the arts. Of the many hundreds of letters which she and Moore exchanged for almost forty years, only 276 of his survive, the rest having been lost or purposely destroyed by her.

"I prize nothing on earth as much as you and . . . I shall die thinking of you," he writes at one time; such sentiments are repeated frequently. Yet, these are not the only thoughts expressed in these letters; Maud Cunard was an intelligent and educated woman, and Moore, conscious of this, refers many times to music, literature, painting, and everyday occurrences. Those readers interested in the drama will find that Moore also refers to his own plays, among them *The Passing of the Essenes*, about Christ, and *The Making of an Immortal*, a comedy about Shakespeare. In short, this is an entertaining and revealing collection of letters of interest to anyone studying the life and art of George Moore.

RICHARD HARRIS
Indiana University

UNCLE JOE CANNON, ARCHFOE OF INSURGENCY: A HISTORY OF THE RISE AND FALL OF CANNONISM. By William Rea Gwinn. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957; pp. viii+314. $5.00.

This book is a result of a doctoral dissertation in history completed in 1953 at the University of Notre Dame and issued in 1955 on microfilm.

Gwinn has written a readable report of the struggle of "Progressive" Republicans to wrest control from standpatter Uncle Joe Cannon, Speaker of the House during the first decade of the twentieth century. The author examined the private papers of Cannon, Roosevelt, Taft, Norris, Mann, William Allen White, and others as well as contemporary newspaper accounts.

Perhaps the primary interest of the book to readers of this journal is an account of the rise and fall of the influence of the Speaker. In discussing the establishment of the "Reed Rules," Gwinn presents an interesting analysis of the conflict between the criteria of majority rule and minority rights.

Unfortunately, Gwinn doesn't write directly to a thesis. The focus often shifts among several controversies: the personal praise or blame of Cannon himself; the political schism between Republican standpatters and progressives; and the dispute over the extent of the Speaker's influence. These themes are not well unified into a single dominating thesis. Furthermore, Gwinn tends to devote considerable space to matters which seem at best only loosely related to any of the major motifs.

In spite of these shortcomings the book should be read by those interested in the history of procedure in the House of Representatives.

WAYNE E. BROCKRIEDE
University of Illinois

SELECTED SPEECHES: 1948-1955. By HRH The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957; pp. x+156. $3.00.

This is a collection of fifty addresses made by HRH The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh—who happens to be the husband of the Queen of England. Presumably they were all given with her knowledge and consent. They are mostly ceremonial pieces—on occasions of visits to London, Edinburgh, Wales, Canada, and elsewhere.

There are two longer addresses in the collection that best reveal the speaker. The rest are very short and are in the nature of "duty" performances.

On 7 August 1957 The Duke delivered the Presidential address to the British Association in Edinburgh and on 16 December 1954 he gave the British Commonwealth and Empire Lecture to the Royal Aeronautical Society. Both addresses are well prepared, well adapted, and both were well received. They portray the man as a broad-minded and remarkably versatile leader. They are genuine speeches—not ghost written. They illustrate good rhetorical principles throughout. I recommend them for comparative study and for examples.

H. F. Harding
The Ohio State University

INTRODUCTION TO MASS COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH. Edited by Ralph O. Nafziger and David Manning White. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958; pp. 244. $5.00.

It is unusual to find a single-volume introductory statement of philosophy and approach to experimental method which has adequate breadth, and is at the same time sufficiently penetrating, to be useful as a textbook in a graduate course. But to find both of these attributes expressed with stylistic precision and perspicuity is news, indeed. The seven chapters (separately authored essays) center well in the book's title, the scope of each necessarily limited, but each appended with ample references exceedingly well selected. An especially good orientation chapter is followed by others on planning, experimental method, field methods, statistical methods, measurement, and scientific method. The authors are Wilbur Schramm, Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr., Percy H. Tannenbaum, Roy E. Carter, Jr., John E. Alman and David M. White, Paul J. Deutschmann, and Bruce H. Westley.

The volume was authorized by the Council on Research of the Association for Education in Journalism and designed as an introduction to behavioral research for beginning graduate students. The editors state in the Preface that this book "can provide the advanced degree candidate in journalism with helpful and much needed lessons in the planning and design of his thesis and other research projects." It should serve, likewise, for beginning graduate students in speech and, in my opinion, should be seriously considered as a textbook for those graduate courses with such titles as "Experimental Research in Oral Communication."

Raymond G. Smith
Indiana University

SELECTED READINGS IN CURRENT PROBLEMS. Edited by Harry P. Kerr. Arlington, Massachusetts: n.p., 1958; pp. viii+99. Paper $1.00.

This handy booklet is designed to aid the student in search of a suitable speech topic by exposing him to a series of fifteen carefully chosen speeches and articles. What is presented here, then, is a source book of ideas. The work is divided into the three general subjects of segregation, freedom of expression, and education (labor and nuclear power might have been equally appropriate)—subjects of importance because "they affect the well-being of every citizen." In order to emphasize ideas rather than their amplification, the author has skillfully abridged many of the selections without sacrificing continuity of thought. Preceding each of the three subjects is a brief introduction designed to stimulate student thought and to encourage further reading.

The value of such a booklet for the beginning public speaker, especially one in a liberal arts institution, is obvious. Perhaps, however, even the author has overlooked the potential usefulness of his work as a source book for students of group discussion about to investigate controversial public questions. A timely and perceptive group of readings, this book is well worth its modest price.

Goodwin Berquist
The Ohio State University

BASIC EXPERIENCES IN SPEECH. By Wayne N. Thompson and Seth A. Fessenden. (Second Edition.) Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958; pp. xii+444.

This is a thoroughly revised second edition. All examples have been brought up-to-date, and new materials have been liberally added.

The first three chapters present the "fundamentals" of speech under the headings of the speaker, his composition, and his presentation. The last eleven chapters apply these fundamentals to reading aloud, discussion, public speaking, cross-examination debating, and speaking in a legislative assembly. Activities are arranged in order of increasing "psychological stress." The book's organization is attractive, but it is hard to apply the fundamentals eleven times without being repetitive in spots. Also, if reading aloud is, as the authors claim, more difficult than public speaking, why is it the first activity presented? One must assume that difficulty and psychological stress are not related. Other than organization, the authors' main difficulty is a tendency to use terms which need further clarification—a tendency especially noticeable in their treatment of style.

These are, however, minor objections. The book has much to offer. The authors write with the assurance of men of experience, and with the verve of men who know students. The book covers many activities, perhaps too many, but throughout remains basically sound.

LLOYD WATKINS
Ohio University

TELEVISION NEWS REPORTING. By CBS News Staff. Illustrated by Robert Osborn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958; pp. 180. $5.75.

Despite the fact that this appears to be a 180-page commercial for CBS News, it certainly is good reading. It contains a lot of practical information about the selection and preparation of television news—information based on many years of experience. John Day, Director of CBS News, describes the book as a service manual for ready news-room reference. It can also serve as an excellent reference text for radio and television news courses. Sections on news editing, film selection and integration, news writing and newscasting are especially useful. The two chapters on last-minute preparations for the Douglas Edwards News Show and suggestions for on-the-air performance could be helpful reading for students of television production and performance.

On the minus side, the book is pretty much a story of the CBS news operation only, with little consideration of techniques and methods employed by the other networks. One would, of course, expect this. Secondly, some areas in the book, such as TV News Problems, Use of Still Pictures, and the News Line-up are treated rather lightly and in a somewhat superficial manner.

However, this is now probably the best available text on the subject of television news. All right, NBC and ABC, it's your turn.

JAMES E. LYNCH
Indiana University

THE BOOK OF UNUSUAL QUOTATIONS. Selected and edited by Rudolf Flesch. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. x+338. $3.95.

Unlike Bartlett, Flesch attempts to provide speakers and writers with "unfamiliar" quotations. Although something less than the "gold mine of new ideas" advertized on the dust jacket, the result is nevertheless a useful collection of some 6,000 entries, most of which the editor rightly classifies as "paradox," "semi-paradox," or "striking witticism." Favorite sources (none of which is identified except by author): Samuel Butler, G. K. Chesterton, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Anatole France, Goethe, William Hazlitt, Kin Hubbard, Samuel Johnson, La Rochefoucauld, Montaigne, George Bernard Shaw, Thoreau, Mark Twain, Oscar Wilde. Only five quotations are from Shakespeare. Sample entry: "The greatest wisdom is like stupidity; the greatest eloquence is like stuttering. Lao-tse."

R. G. G.

EVERYMAN'S DICTIONARY OF LITERARY BIOGRAPHY: ENGLISH & AMERICAN. Compiled after John W. Cousin by D. C. Browning. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1958; pp. xii+752. $5.00.

This helpful revision of Cousin's original volume compiled some fifty years ago includes some 2,300 brief biographies, with "popular or 'low-brow' authors" admitted on the same terms as "the sophisticated or 'high-brows.'" Approximately one-third of those listed are Americans, including figures so diverse as Margaret Mead, Kenneth Burke, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Tennessee Williams, Anita Loos, Thorstein Veblen, Ernest Thompson Seton, Rex Stout, and Woodrow Wilson. Among the missing: Thomas Sheridan, S. N. Behrman, Arthur Miller, Randolph Bourne, Randall Jarrell, Glenway Wescott, J. D. Salinger, Wallace Stevens, Yvor Winters.

R. G. G.

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

Sabbaticals and Fringe Benefits

The shortage of college teachers is now being featured on radio and TV, and in the press. "Will your child be able to get into college?" is a query dramatized with all the fervor bestowed on the latest patent medicine. It is clear that even our national security depends on the number of people who can be educated in our colleges, and that the number of students depends upon the supply of teachers. If we really want to, we can supply money and buildings in short order, but no crash program for producing mature scholars overnight has yet been devised.

That so many scholars are leaving the campus for the attractions of business and government is not explained entirely by low salaries. In many cases dreary conditions of employment are at fault. The professor takes the vow of poverty and does a novitiate of A.B., A.M., Ph.D., not unlike that of a monk. Unlike the bricklayer, who sets a reasonable maximum for the number of bricks in a day, or the painter, who limits the width of his brush, the professor imposes more and more duties, higher and higher standards upon himself. So it becomes imperative that his working conditions shall not only be adequate in fundamentals and incidentals, but that special incentives be added that are peculiar to his line of work.

Certainly the ordinary rewards, those that might prevail in other lines, as in business, should not be neglected. Salary schedules have to be rebuilt. But it is doubtful that a faculty attracted mainly by salary incentive would be worth assembling; they had better go into manufacture of nuts and bolts where there is no ceiling on wages. Retirement systems, which are generally inadequate (see report in Shop Talk, XLIII, 220-223), have to be strengthened. Group health insurance is a fringe benefit the college can supply at half the per capita cost to individuals in individual plans. Campus services for faculty and faculty families can be expanded—infirmary, emergency housing, low cost meals, etc.—although in college communities where the local burghers regard the faculty as their special economic preserve, the college administration must show courage. What can be done if one tries is being illustrated at a little college, Saint Joseph's, in Rensselaer, Indiana. On a basic Ford grant of $270,000, loans are made up to 98% of total cost for faculty housing. An acre of land is leased for $10 a year. Interest of 4½% on the loan is used to raise faculty salaries, now with a range of $11,000 to $18,000 for full professors.

One incentive toward making college teaching attractive is paying some or all of the expenses of attending a convention of scholars (see Shop Talk report, XLIII, 103-106). Professors are encouraged to do something good for themselves and the profession. A grant of $100 tax free is worth at least $125 in earned income. In addition, when the allowance is made in a state institution, where travel by public transportation is tax exempt, an additional

The first three chapters present the "fundamentals" of speech under the headings of the speaker, his composition, and his presentation. The last eleven chapters apply these fundamentals to reading aloud, discussion, public speaking, cross-examination debating, and speaking in a legislative assembly. Activities are arranged in order of increasing "psychological stress." The book's organization is attractive, but it is hard to apply the fundamentals eleven times without being repetitive in spots. Also, if reading aloud is, as the authors claim, more difficult than public speaking, why is it the first activity presented? One must assume that difficulty and psychological stress are not related. Other than organization, the authors' main difficulty is a tendency to use terms which need further clarification—a tendency especially noticeable in their treatment of style.

These are, however, minor objections. The book has much to offer. The authors write with the assurance of men of experience, and with the verve of men who know students. The book covers many activities, perhaps too many, but throughout remains basically sound.

LLOYD WATKINS
Ohio University

TELEVISION NEWS REPORTING. By CBS News Staff. Illustrated by Robert Osborn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958; pp. 180. $5.75.

Despite the fact that this appears to be a 180-page commercial for CBS News, it certainly is good reading. It contains a lot of practical information about the selection and preparation of television news—information based on many years of experience. John Day, Director of CBS News, describes the book as a service manual for ready news-room reference. It can also serve as an excellent reference text for radio and television news courses. Sections on news editing, film selection and integration, news writing and newscasting are especially useful. The two chapters on last-minute preparations for the Douglas Edwards News Show and suggestions for on-the-air performance could be helpful reading for students of television production and performance.

On the minus side, the book is pretty much a story of the CBS news operation only, with little consideration of techniques and methods employed by the other networks. One would, of course, expect this. Secondly, some areas in the book, such as TV News Problems, Use of Still Pictures, and the News Line-up are treated rather lightly and in a somewhat superficial manner.

However, this is now probably the best available text on the subject of television news. All right, NBC and ABC, it's your turn.

JAMES E. LYNCH
Indiana University

THE BOOK OF UNUSUAL QUOTATIONS. Selected and edited by Rudolf Flesch. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. x+338. $3.95.

Unlike Bartlett, Flesch attempts to provide speakers and writers with "unfamiliar" quotations. Although something less than the "gold mine of new ideas" advertized on the dust jacket, the result is nevertheless a useful collection of some 6,000 entries, most of which the editor rightly classifies as "paradox," "semi-paradox," or "striking witticism." Favorite sources (none of which is identified except by author): Samuel Butler, G. K. Chesterton, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Anatole France, Goethe, William Hazlitt, Kin Hubbard, Samuel Johnson, La Rochefoucauld, Montaigne, George Bernard Shaw, Thoreau, Mark Twain, Oscar Wilde. Only five quotations are from Shakespeare. Sample entry: "The greatest wisdom is like stupidity; the greatest eloquence is like stuttering. Lao-tse."

R. G. G.

EVERYMAN'S DICTIONARY OF LITERARY BIOGRAPHY: ENGLISH & AMERICAN. Compiled after John W. Cousin by D. C. Browning. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1958; pp. xii+752. $5.00.

This helpful revision of Cousin's original volume compiled some fifty years ago includes some 2,300 brief biographies, with "popular or 'low-brow' authors" admitted on the same terms as "the sophisticated or 'high-brows.'" Approximately one-third of those listed are Americans, including figures so diverse as Margaret Mead, Kenneth Burke, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Tennessee Williams, Anita Loos, Thorstein Veblen, Ernest Thompson Seton, Rex Stout, and Woodrow Wilson. Among the missing: Thomas Sheridan, S. N. Behrman, Arthur Miller, Randolph Bourne, Randall Jarrell, Glenway Wescott, J. D. Salinger, Wallace Stevens, Yvor Winters.

R. G. G.

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

Sabbaticals and Fringe Benefits

The shortage of college teachers is now being featured on radio and TV, and in the press. "Will your child be able to get into college?" is a query dramatized with all the fervor bestowed on the latest patent medicine. It is clear that even our national security depends on the number of people who can be educated in our colleges, and that the number of students depends upon the supply of teachers. If we really want to, we can supply money and buildings in short order, but no crash program for producing mature scholars overnight has yet been devised.

That so many scholars are leaving the campus for the attractions of business and government is not explained entirely by low salaries. In many cases dreary conditions of employment are at fault. The professor takes the vow of poverty and does a novitiate of A.B., A.M., Ph.D., not unlike that of a monk. Unlike the bricklayer, who sets a reasonable maximum for the number of bricks in a day, or the painter, who limits the width of his brush, the professor imposes more and more duties, higher and higher standards upon himself. So it becomes imperative that his working conditions shall not only be adequate in fundamentals and incidentals, but that special incentives be added that are peculiar to his line of work.

Certainly the ordinary rewards, those that might prevail in other lines, as in business, should not be neglected. Salary schedules have to be rebuilt. But it is doubtful that a faculty attracted mainly by salary incentive would be worth assembling; they had better go into manufacture of nuts and bolts where there is no ceiling on wages. Retirement systems, which are generally inadequate (see report in Shop Talk, XLIII, 220-223), have to be strengthened. Group health insurance is a fringe benefit the college can supply at half the per capita cost to individuals in individual plans. Campus services for faculty and faculty families can be expanded—infirmary, emergency housing, low cost meals, etc.—although in college communities where the local burghers regard the faculty as their special economic preserve, the college administration must show courage. What can be done if one tries is being illustrated at a little college, Saint Joseph's, in Rensselaer, Indiana. On a basic Ford grant of $270,000, loans are made up to 98% of total cost for faculty housing. An acre of land is leased for $10 a year. Interest of 4½% on the loan is used to raise faculty salaries, now with a range of $11,000 to $18,000 for full professors.

One incentive toward making college teaching attractive is paying some or all of the expenses of attending a convention of scholars (see Shop Talk report, XLIII, 103-106). Professors are encouraged to do something good for themselves and the profession. A grant of $100 tax free is worth at least $125 in earned income. In addition, when the allowance is made in a state institution, where travel by public transportation is tax exempt, an additional

10% bonus is carried. Some colleges offer tax free summer fellowships to encourage faculty members to lay out a project. Stenographic services for preparation of scholarly articles and books should be guaranteed. Many department offices get so busy in mimeographing directives and course syllabi there is little facility for the work of the scholar. The college should provide tuition for the professor's children and spouse, and a system of tuition exchanges. It is ironic that increased tuition costs, in part necessary to raise professors' salaries, should make it increasingly difficult for the professor to send his own children to college. Saint Joseph's grants free tuition to faculty children, or the total amount, $500 a year, to be used at another school.

A college should have a faculty club —or perhaps it had better be called a center, to ward off fears of frivolity— where members may do some committeeing at lunch, and associate with colleagues in other fields. Much remains to be done to make retirement something to be enjoyed and not dreaded. The emeritus member should have office and laboratory space, and stenographic help. He should not be turned out or thrown on the mercies of the janitor the day after official retirement. Whereas the retired factory worker may want to clear away for Florida immediately, the professor may want to stay on, accustomed as he is to the library, the association with fellow scholars, the intellectual stimulation that comes on a college campus. For such people, some system of emeriti housing, sponsored by the university, would free the retirees from many cares and permit them to live among their fellows. Princeton University is now sponsoring such a scheme. The beneficiary of all these fringe benefits could retire with a flourish and, with his free emeritus membership in SAA, be an object of admiration to the younger men rather than one of concern or pity.

The basic fringe benefit, of course, is the teaching calendar, with holidays various and summer off. One bard sings it this way:

> A college professor I would be,
> With a nice soft job, and all my summers free.
> That summer-long vacation so appealed to me
> That now I am a Doctor of Philosophy![1]

Unfortunately the plan does not always include the wherewithal to live those three months, although some continuity may be provided by dividing the nine months' salary into twelve monthly payments. Many professors have to supplement their incomes by summer teaching or odd jobs. There is also the routine of preparation for new courses and so forth for the coming fall. The sum of knowledge has become so great that most professors who wish to keep abreast, and to make any sort of name for themselves, have to spend not only summers, but vacations and evenings in study, research, and writing.

To give the professor a breather, the blessed system of sabbaticals was invented. Under it, every seventh year is a free year, on salary. The standard plan is the year off at half pay or the half year at full pay. The origin of the term, of course, is from the Jewish sabbatical year, in which the fields were to lie fallow, at rest. In the terminology of agriculture, fallow land is plowed, tilled, the weeds kept down, but no crop raised. So the professor plows and tills himself, but is not expected to produce a crop of students that year.

How extensive is the system? There seems to be no definitive answer. Someone ought to take a sabbatical to report on sabbaticals. In 1951, the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers made a survey. They

found some sort of sabbaticals in over thirty countries, with the system "most firmly rooted in the British Commonwealth and in the United States."[2] In 1954, the NEA[3] found that 50.7% of degree-granting institutions in the United States give some aid to faculty members continuing graduate study. Much of this aid seems to be for completion of degrees. Colleges are more eager to get that degree into the catalogue and the institutional rating statistics than to aid post-degree meditation and research. By sabbatical, we mean leave for the mature teacher, who has finished "going to school," in order that, unharassed, he may enrich his life and become a more humane person and a more competent scholar. He may travel, read, research, associate, do those things that are essentially "taking in" and not "giving out." The use of a sabbatical to write a textbook for profit seems generally frowned upon.

Other surveys supply other bits of information. In 1947, a survey[4] of 52 land-grant colleges was made. Some "provision" for sabbaticals was reported in 29. In 17 schools the arrangement was automatic. In others some merit system was applied, and in one, leaves were available only for full professors. The California State Employees' Association[5] surveyed 237 colleges in a random sample, in 1956. They found 137 with sabbaticals, 100 without. But the conditions imposed in many of the institutions indicate "sabbaticals" was interpreted rather loosely. For example, the number of leaves in 16 of the institutions was determined by money available; 14 restricted leaves to 10% of those eligible; 9 limited leaves by ability of faculty to absorb load, and so on. In 1958, Florida State University[6] sent questionnaires to all state and land-grant institutions and received a 100% reply. Of the 71 schools, 45 (63%) have sabbaticals, 26 (36.6%) have not. But here again so many conditions are imposed it is difficult to tell what actually happens. Four per cent limit leaves to full professors; only 35% include all ranks above instructor; in 44 schools the leave is not automatic.

Thinking one more survey would do no harm, we sent questionnaires addressed "Head of Department" to 325 colleges and universities with active speech programs. The results of the 175 replies are given in the table below. Line A, 7.4%, are the schools granting sabbaticals regularly without special review. General practice is to require at least one year's service upon return, but other than this, the leave is granted automatically. Line B, 16%, are the schools which require approval of a sabbatical project. In many cases requirements are very liberal. "The applicant must agree to get out of town," reports one school. This system of review has two main purposes. One is to help the professor plan his leave. The other is to weed out those who lie fallow every year, and wouldn't know what to do with a year off. A former president of Miami University reports that he changed his system of sabbaticals from automatic to selective when he discovered on a visit to another campus a professor who "simply dropped his classes, remained at home, played golf, and jeered at his fellow professors, who were hard at work."[7] Line C, the total of schools with sabbaticals, 23%, is probably a bit high. There is a tendency, in answering questionnaires, to put one's best foot forward. One university, for example, replied sabbaticals are automatic, and is so reported in the figures. Actually the system was just started last year, there are 2,500 staff members to be provided for, and many will have to wait their

turn for years to come. Another school reported regular sabbaticals, no questions asked. We discovered, however, that there is one sabbatical available a year for a faculty of thirty. Our *guess* is that genuine sabbaticals do not prevail in more than 15% of our colleges and universities. The greater the negative error found in this guess, the greater we shall be pleased.

SABBATICAL LEAVES
(175 returns from 325 questionnaires sent to degree granting colleges and universities)

	No. of schools	%
A. Sabbaticals automatic—no conditions	13	7.43
B. Sabbaticals automatic—conditions imposed	28	16.00
C. *Total automatic sabbaticals*	*41*	*23.43*
D. "Sabbaticals" apportioned	74	42.29
E. Leaves with pay apportioned	9	5.14
F. No provision	51	29.14
	175	100.0

Line D accounts for schools which in some way approximate a system of sabbaticals, but operate on a partial basis. Sometimes a quota system is applied, as 2% of the faculty in any one year, or the number of "sabbaticals" is dependent on the money available. This system prevails in 42% of the schools. E, 5%, accounts for schools with provisions for special grants for leaves, but with no attempt to approach the sabbatical scheme. F, schools without any provision for refresher leaves, totals 29%.

From the figures and comments received in our survey, from some reading on the subject, and with the benefit of many letters received from others who have inquired into the matter, some general observations may be made:

1. Most sabbatical systems were discontinued in World War II. Since then, the tendency has been away from automatic leaves, and toward review of project by committees and administration. Cornell, once an example of the inviolate sabbatical, now has review by the president. Some universities require elaborate declarations of purpose. Concerning one of the questions on the application form, "[Give] a statement of the applicant's preparation and significant contributions in the field of activity with which the sabbatical project is concerned," a wag wrote:

My articles, foot-noted, are everywhere quoted,
At conventions my fame is projected;
And among all the battlers in Hiltons and Statlers,
My opinions are never neglected.[8]

2. Of the institutions not having any system of sabbaticals, many are large and well established.

3. The question is a live one, and many plans for sabbaticals are underway. At Washington and Lee, the dean has appointed a committee to investigate.

4. Modified "sabbaticals" exist in great variety. At Bates, a "sabbatical" is required the seventh year after 13 years of service, but not during the seven years prior to retirement at 70.

5. Many systems exist on paper but are not in effect. "We have a complete system of sabbaticals," writes one school, "but since no money has ever been available no sabbatical leave has been granted." Another school replies that sabbatical leaves are liberally granted, provided those who receive them can manage a foundation grant of some sort. Still another replies that the member on sabbatical receives in pay the difference between his salary and that necessary to replace him.

6. Some schools have modified the essential sabbatical pattern, but have preserved the spirit. Colorado State College has had for decades a policy of sabbaticals for those on tenure, after each 20 quarters (about six years). No questions are asked, and no conditions are imposed on mature scholars, interpreted to mean those having a Ph.D. The College of Wooster has two systems. The sabbatical, reserved for full professors, provides full pay for a year each eight years. This is the "refresh the spring," "re-

charge the battery," sort of leave. Another plan, research leave, available upon call and review, provides full salary for a year to execute some definite project.

7. Holding the line on old fashioned sabbaticals, no strings, are a variety of schools, including Bethany College, Earlham College, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, Denison University, Williams College, DePauw University, Stanford University, Duke University, Carleton College.

Perhaps with these seven observations on the seventh year we should rest. But why go to all this trouble without making a prediction of some sort. Here it is. In ancient Hebrew legend there was a Sabbatical River, which flowed earnestly six days, and on the seventh it rested. When that river is found, and the legend verified, every professor will receive a sabbatical, with all the additional fringe benefits herein enumerated.

CITATIONS

1. Gordon Shull, "When I Was a (Pre-Ph.D.) Lad," *AAUP Bulletin*, XLI (1955), 569.
2. *Nature*, CLXVIII (1951), 509.
3. "Instructional Staff Practices and Policies in Degree-Granting Institutions, 1953-54," NEA *Research Bulletin*, XXXII, 4 (1954).
4. Edith Ruebsam, "Sabbatical Leaves in Land-Grant Institutions," *AAUP Bulletin*, XXXIII (1947), 717-720.
5. Joel A. Burkman, "A Report on Sabbatical Leave Provisions in Colleges and Universities in the United States," California State Employees' Association, Sacramento, 1956.
6. "A Survey of Sabbatical Leave Policies and Practices in State Universities and Land-Grant Institutions: 1957-1958," Florida State University, 1958.
7. Frank L. McVey and Raymond M. Hughes, *Problems of College and University Administration*, The Iowa State College Press, 1952, p. 162.
8. Leo Kirschenbaum, "A Gloss on Regulations Governing Sabbatical Leaves of Absence," *AAUP Bulletin*, XLI (1955), 693-695.

ON LEAVE

Arizona State College, Tempe: Frank Byers, on sabbatical in Europe, studying theatre.

Bradley University: Lillian Aitchison, on leave of absence.

Idaho State College: Charles Bilyeu, on sabbatical for the year; Charlotte Cleeland has returned from a sabbatical spent in post-doctoral study of voice problems.

Illinois State Normal University: Eric Bickley on sabbatical at Michigan State for work on a Ph.D.

Iowa State College: Ralph Towne, year's leave to study at Michigan State.

Kent State University: Edward C. Hutchinson, year's leave to study at Ohio State; Thomas R. McManus, has returned after a year's leave for study; Mrs. Katherine Norton, has returned to duty after a year's sick leave.

Marietta College: Bernard Russi, Jr. has returned from a year's leave for study toward his doctorate at Wayne State University. His wife, Mrs. Julia Russi, who also spent the year doing graduate work at Wayne in speech therapy, has taken over supervision of the speech clinic and the teaching of courses in speech correction.

Purdue University: M. D. Steer will be on leave this summer to inspect research and clinical programs in Europe. In August he plans to attend the eleventh Congress of the International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatrics in London, and to give a paper on "Modern Instrumentation for Diagnosis, Therapy, and Research."

Stanford University: Helene Blattner has returned after a year's leave; Irene Griffin was on leave fall semester to study theatre in Japan; Norman Philbrick is on sabbatical for the year, studying the theatre in the East and in Europe; F. Cowles Strickland, on leave for a second year as lecturer at the National Finnish Theatre, Helsinki.

State University of Iowa: Sam L. Becker, on year's leave to study mass media, Columbia University. He has a Ford Foundation fellowship.

State University of New York Teachers College, Fredonia: Lloyd Kaiser, year's leave to complete degree.

Stetson University: Bruce Griffiths, on leave to study at Indiana University.

Syracuse University: Agnes Allardyce is on two-year leave to work with the International Cooperation Administration as advisor in the teaching of English in Vietnam; Eugene S. Foster, on leave in Morocco to orient Moroccan students who will enter Syracuse.

Tulane University: Paul Hostetler, year's leave to study at Louisiana State University.

University of Hawaii: Elizabeth B. Carr, on sabbatical to be a visiting fellow at Cornell University; John P. Hoshor, on duty after a half year's sabbatical visiting universities on the mainland; Lloyd Newcomer, on sabbatical first semester, 1959-60, to study speech training in California.

University of Illinois: Halbert E. Gulley, on sabbatical to study group process and inter-personal relations in discussion; Clara Behringer on sabbatical to study theatre in Germany, par-

ticularly productions in the *Schiller-Jahr*, the 200th anniversary of Schiller's birth.

University of Kansas: Nat Eek is continuing his leave of absence to complete work on his Ph.D. at Ohio State University; Sally Six is working toward a doctorate at the University of Illinois.

University of Michigan: Edward Stasheff, on duty after a year's leave with the Educational Television and Radio Center in Ann Arbor; Edgar E. Willis, on leave for the year to work at the Center.

University of Oklahoma: Jack Douglas, on leave at the University of Texas; Charles Green, on sabbatical for the year, to study British literature and rhetoric, in London; Carl Ritzman, on leave at Cornell University, as consultant on the speech and hearing program.

University of Pittsburgh: Lloyd Weldon, Jr., is at Michigan State working on a doctorate.

University of Richmond: Alton Williams has returned from a semester sabbatical in Europe studying theatre.

University of Texas: Donald M. Williams, on leave to teach at State University of Iowa.

Valparaiso University: Van Kussrow, Jr., on leave for the year to study at Indiana University, on a Danforth Fellowship.

Vanderbilt University: Dwight L. Freshley, on a Fulbright in Athens, Greece.

Western Michigan University: Faber DeChaine, on leave for work on a Ph.D. degree, University of Minnesota.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to many persons who have sent us materials on sabbatical leaves. Special acknowledgment should go to: Bertram H. Davis, Staff Associate, American Association of University Professors; Walter Crosby Eells, whose bibliography on leaves of absence in *College Teachers and College Teaching—an Annotated Bibliography on College and University Faculty Members and Instructional Methods* (Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1957) should be consulted; Raymond F. Howes, staff associate, American Council on Education; Robert E. Iffert, specialist for faculty and student services, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Francis P. King, research officer, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America; F. L. Wormald, associate director, Association of American Colleges.

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

NATIONAL

Speech Association of America: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; (1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30).

American Educational Theatre Association: with SAA in Washington; (1960, University of Denver, August 27-29; 1961, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30).

Delta Sigma Rho: John Carroll University, Cleveland, May 7-9.

Pi Kappa Delta: Bowling Green State University, March 22-27.

REGIONAL

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 9-11. (Golden anniversary convention.)

Southern States: Sheraton-Seelbach, Louisville, April 6-10.

Central States: Statler, Detroit, April 10-11.

RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation: Sheraton, Philadelphia, April 30, May 1-2.

Acoustical Society of America: Ottawa, May 14-16.

International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatrics: London, August 17-22.

FULBRIGHTS IN SPEECH. In the September *Today's Speech*, editor Robert T. Oliver has an informative piece. It is here reprinted with the kind permission of Professor Oliver.

TEACHING SPEECH ABROAD

Would you like to spend a year abroad, teaching Speech? The chances are best in Theatre and Speech Therapy, but are not negligible in General Speech (public speaking, group discussion, radio-TV, and voice improvement). During the past five years 54 Speech teachers have applied for Fulbright grants; five were appointed. For all subject areas, the ratio of appointments to applications is one to four; for all the areas of Speech, the ratio is one to ten.

What accounts for our lower ratio? The reason primarily is that teachers of Speech have not been using the right approach. This is the conclusion of Francis A. Young, Executive Secretary, Committee on International Exchange of

Persons (Fulbright Committee), Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Washington, D. C.; Cornelius R. McLaughlin, Chief, Teacher Exchange Section, Division of International Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Donald A. Bullard, Director, Department of Information, Institute of International Education, N. Y. C.; and William Frye, Director of Information, N. Y. Office, UNESCO, speaking at the April SAES Convention, on a program chaired by Professor J. Calvin Callaghan.

What, then, should applicants do?

The basic approach is to select the country to which you wish to go (one in which English is the primary or secondary language); then, get in touch with leading educational authorities in that country. Discuss with them a possible teaching program—based upon their needs and your abilities. Try to get their definite approval for a specific teaching assignment which you might fulfill in their schools. This might consist of: (a) teaching classes in oral English, or in discussion, public speaking, or radio programming; (b) serving as a "travelling consultant" to visit schools in their country to advise on the development of a suitable Speech program adapted to their needs; or (c) teaching classes on "Methods of Teaching Speech" (concentrated primarily on voice and diction improvement, or oral English). As part of your essential preparation, you should: (a) learn all you can about the country in which you are interested; (b) prepare yourself to go in a spirit of humility, recognizing its achievements, and being eager to help without assuming any vestige of superiority; (c) understand that living conditions will be quite different from those to which you are accustomed—and approach this fact with a spirit of adventure and pleasure.

When a suitable program has been worked out in correspondence with the educational authorities of the country of your choice, then—and only then—are you ready to present the plan to the proper American officials. If the country has a "Fulbright program," your application may then be addressed to Dr. Young; if it does not have such a program, your inquiry should go to Dr. McLaughlin and (concurrently) to the Leaders-Specialists Department of the Division of International Education, Department of State—or to Dr. Bullard, who will be able to assist you in presenting an application to the Ford Foundation.

The Department of State has sent abroad about 100 teachers to assist foreign Departments of Education to conduct their programs of teaching oral English. Significantly, almost all of these have been professors of English, with only a handful from the Speech profession. The reason is that foreign educators are familiar with our English programs but are uninformed about our work in Speech. It is up to us, as members of the Speech profession, to "educate" our compeers abroad concerning the philosophy, methods, and resources of our Speech teachers. No one will do this for us. It is up to us.

Conclusion: if you want to spend a year teaching abroad, don't make a "blind" application for a Fulbright grant, but proceed as advised above! First of all, work through the Ministry of Education (or an accredited University or large city school system) of the country of your choice. The experience will be valuable; it is worth the trouble of making intelligent preparation.

FULBRIGHT—CASE STUDY. What happens on a Fulbright? We asked Roy Umble, returned this fall from two years in Athens, to tell us, and not to spare the personal details. Here is his account.

Fulbrighting in Athens

Two years of Fulbrighting in Athens, Greece, have been for us an ideal sabbatical. Mrs. Umble and I and our two teenage daughters believe that we got what we wanted—and a good deal more: professional service in a new location, traveling and studying abroad, and exposure to new points of view including the opportunity of looking at the United States from a distance. Among our new friends we number our Greek hosts and other Americans, official and unofficial ambassadors. Our background had made us particularly eager to see the places made famous in Biblical and classical history. Athens was our starting point for vacation trips to other parts of Greece and the Middle East, so frequently in the headlines.

Because I believe that the person in speech has a great deal to offer to this teacher exchange program, I am happy to report on the application and travel details.

First the applicant should get the approval of his administration for a leave. This understanding is important if he wishes to return to his U.S. teaching post, and even if he doesn't his application needs a strong recommendation from his department head or dean.

Persons interested in a teaching grant (for secondary and junior college level) should apply to the Teacher Programs Branch, Division of International Education, US Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington 25, D. C. The greatest

number of positions is available at this level.

Persons interested in a lecturing or teaching (university level) grant should apply to the Conference of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington 25, D. C. Applicants for post-doctoral research grants should apply to the same address.

My schedule was as follows:

Spring and summer 1955—received permission for a sabbatical leave.

August 1955—requested application forms from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

October 15, 1955—met deadline for submitting that four-page application in triplicate, plus additional data including three references. Choose these references carefully; they are very important.

November 1955—Interview in Chicago.

February 1956—Medical examination.

March 26, 1956—Official appointment from US Department of State, Professional Activities Division, International Educational Exchange Service for "Teaching English as a Foreign Language" at Pierce College, Elleniko, Athens, Greece. Allowance in Greek drachmas 180,000 ($6,000) plus travel for the grantee but not for his dependents.

July 9 to August 17, 1956—Orientation at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan.

September 4, 1956—Arrived in Athens with approximately twenty other Fulbrighters. Half of them were assigned to American sponsored schools in Salonica or to national schools in some of the larger cities of Greece.

April 17, 1957—Received notice of renewal of appointment for 1957-58.

June 30, 1958—Left Greece in our Volkswagen for a second trip across Yugoslavia, this time along the Dalmatian coast.

August 1958—Returned to Goshen in time for a pre-school workshop and the usual round of committee meetings.

Since 1950, Pierce College has stressed the oral approach, using materials and methods adapted from the Fries-Lado series of the University of Michigan. This departmental emphasis achieved a unity based on language learning in which literature, composition, and speech provide significant contributions. Vocabulary and structure (grammar) serve useful purposes within meaningful school and community situations such as the American Thanksgiving, the annual bazaar (to raise money for a Greek village), or a national holiday. Beginning units stress conversation and phonemics; reading and writing are added as rapidly as class progress permits. In addition to an equivalent of fifteen to eighteen hours per week I served as sponsor of the dramatics club and helped to present special assembly programs at Thanksgiving and Christmas. I even practiced with the baseball team and played in the student-faculty game on January 17.

Some students wanted to learn English for later jobs in offices where English was required; others wanted to read American and British books and to write to pen pals who knew English; a few knew that they would study in America under the American Field Service or in American colleges and universities; and the upperclassmen in the school of social work knew that most of the current literature in their field was available only in English.

The teacher of speech who applies for a Fulbright in Greece can count among his assets his interest and background in Greek rhetoric and philosophy, in Greek drama and poetry. At the end of a week of teaching, when phonetics have temporarily lost their glamor, a Greek colleague may serve as your guide to Delphi, Epidaurus, Corinth, Mycenae, Philippi, or Salonica. In Athens, if you wish, you can see the Parthenon every day. Within the beautiful National Archeological Museum are the priceless treasures from the excavations at Mycenae.

In addition to shorter trips within Greece, we used our Easter vacations for longer trips: the first year to Turkey, the second to the heart of the Middle East: Beirut, Damascus, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Rhodes. In the summer of 1957 we drove from Athens to England going north through Greece and Italy and returning through Austria and Yugoslavia.

All of my teaching was in English, but when we traveled in central Europe we were glad for a little German and French (Ph.D. candidates take note). Although we didn't know any Greek when we arrived, we joined a class of Fulbrighters in Athens who drilled about five hours a week for four months using the *Spoken Greek* series published by Henry Holt. The time spent in language study was well worth it. In teaching a foreign language I needed to have patience. My students had difficulty producing a satisfactory [h] in *his* or an [I] in *ship*; so also I had difficulty in producing their "gamma." Word order, intonation, and vocabulary took on new meaning for me. Then, too, there is that satisfaction that comes from being able to ask and give directions, to order a meal and sign up for a hotel room.

Returning to Goshen, my aim will be to try to pour some of this into lectures, speech evaluations, conferences with foreign students, and now and then into a private showing of some of our most prized pictures of the blue Aegean, the Acropolis by moonlight, or an olive grove down the mountain from Delphi.

We have two questions: how can we best use what we have experienced? when, oh when, can we do it again?

ROY UMBLE
Goshen College

REDEKUNST IN DEUTSCHLAND. Departments of speech are something of an American phenomenon, and subjects included in them may be found abroad in various departments. Fred L. Casmir of George Pepperdine College, a German by birth, wondered about how much emphasis is placed on "speech" subjects in Germany. Here is his report.

SPEECH IN GERMAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A questionnaire, in German, was sent to sixteen colleges and universities. Six replied. The term "speech" presented a problem. The questionnaire explained that "speech" is "Kommunikationswissenschaft" (communications science). "Speech subjects" can be translated as "kommunikationswissenschaftliche Faecher."

From the University of Freiburg came an answer through the department of philosophy. One man, Dr. Walter Kuhlman, is working in a field called "Sprechkunde," described as including public address, speech correction, and discussion. Dr. Kuhlman is also interested in phonetics.

The University of Heidelberg replied that no speech subjects are being taught in the philological seminars. The University of Erlangen replied that no work in "speech" is being done. Reply came from the English Seminar. The University of Wuerzburg replied that speech is not being taught as a science, but that practical training in speaking and voice development is offered. In addition, assistance is provided for people with laryngeal difficulties, in a laryngological clinic ("laryngologische Klinik").

Three other universities made more encouraging reports. The University of Bonn replied that these subjects are taught: phonetics ("Phonetik"), oral interpretation ("Interpretation"), radio and television ("Rundfunk und Fernsehen"), acoustics ("Akustik"), linguistics ("Linguistik"), information theory ("Informationstheorie"). About forty students are working in these fields.

The reply from the University of Hamburg came from the Phonetic Laboratory. Three professors are interested in subjects which would be called "speech" in this country. Fields of interest mentioned are: "Phonetik," including voice and speech disorders ("Stimm- und-Sprechstoerungen"), and "Phonologie." Phonetics, voice ("Stimme"), oral interpretation ("Sprechen," "sprecherischer Ausdruck"), dramatics (theatre science—"Theaterwissenschaft") are taught. About seventy students are involved in the courses. Speech correction is handled within the curriculum of the Pedagogic Institute.

From the University of Goettingen, the questionnaire was returned with a detailed letter written by M. H. Haulhausen, "Lektorin fuer Sprechkunde." She reports:

> In West-Germany "Sprechkunde" (speech) is not an independent course of study at any university, as it is in yours. There are only "Lektorate mit selbstaendigem Lehrauftrag" (lecturers classified as independent or non-affiliated with any department). She has been in the United States and has visited speech departments. She refers to "speech people" as "Sprechkundler." Goettingen has two instructors in what we call "speech." About 200 students are enrolled in these courses: public address ("Aussprache oder Vortrag"), discussion ("Diskussion"), oral interpretation ("Sprechkunst"), dramatic performance ("Laienspiele"), radio and television ("Rundfunk und Fernsehen"), debate ("Streitgespraeche"), voice ("Stimmbildung"), and metrics ("Metrik oder Verslehre").

About two dozen recent articles were listed, some written by the correspondents. All this, of course, is but excitement to curiosity.

FRED L. CASMIR
George Pepperdine College

SPRACHEN SIE DEUTSCH. A wag has sent us a copy of that new English-German glossary, with words for a lexicon of missiles. Here are some of the more useful translations:

guided missile: Das schientifiker geschuterwerke firenkrakker

rocket engine: Firenschpitter mit schmoken-und-schnorten

preset guidance: Das senden offen mit ein pattenbacker und finger gekrossen schteerenwerke

hydrogen device: Das eargeschplitten laudenboomer mit ein grosse hollengraund und alles kaput

structural testing section: Das pullen-aparten gruppe
project engineer: Das schwettenoudter

Research

The speech department of Ohio State University, with the support of a Public Health Service Research Grant, is conducting a research project which has as its primary aim the study of the effects on the characteristics of speech output from hearing one's own voice. The study, now in its second year, places particular emphasis on stuttering. Biophysical measurements have established discrepancies among speakers with regard to hearing via bone-tissue pathways. The discrepancies have been used as experimental variables to study their "control value" on the speech output. Among the more interesting results to date has been experimental blockage of phonation. Courtney Stromsta is in charge of the project. Henry M. Moser of OSU has been awarded a contract for the simplification and standardization of communications for NATO and SEATO Air Operations. Mr. Moser is the official United States member of the International Civil Aviation Organization which has headquarters in Montreal.

The Purdue Speech and Hearing Clinic has been awarded a grant of $18,708 from the U. S. Office of Education to conduct a study titled "An Assessment of Behavioral and Academic Implications of Hearing Loss Among School Children." This research will be conducted by M. D. Steer, T. D. Hanley, and G. L. Shaffer. Three graduate research assistants will also participate in the program. The Purdue Clinic has completed another U. S. Office of Education project titled "Applications of Mower's Autistic Theory to the Speech Habilitation of Mentally Retarded Pupils." The Purdue Research Foundation has awarded Mr. Steer a grant to conduct a study titled "Frequency Filtering in Auditory Feed-back Related to Modification of Stuttering Symptoms."

M. D. Steer served as chairman of a special conference on Research Needs in Speech Pathology and Audiology which was held on November 20 in New York City. This conference was sponsored jointly by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Veterans Administration, and the American Speech and Hearing Association. About 250 research specialists participated in the conference. T. D. Hanley assisted in conducting the meeting. Currently Professor Steer is chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Research of the ASHA and Professor Hanley is serving as research associate to the committee.

Richard F. Maher of Butler University has received a Lilly Foundation grant to make a follow-up study of adult stutterers who have received therapy in university clinics.

Teachers College, Columbia University, has been given a grant of $18,703 from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of expanding the program in speech rehabilitation for adults. New courses have been added and the clinical programs in the hospitals expanded.

The University of Pittsburgh has received three grants from the U. S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. One, $75,628, will be used for a two-year study of the "Relationship Between Audiologic Measures and Actual Sociological-Psychological Vocational Disability." This study will be directed by Jack Matthews and Leo G. Doerfler. A second grant of $29,728 will be used in speech and hearing disorders and in traineeships for graduate students. George Shames will direct study on the third grant, one for $600, to develop a scale for the measurement of nasality. The United Cerebral Palsy Association of Greater Pittsburgh has given the university $33,900 for developing training facilities for speech handicapped cerebral palsied children in western Pennsylvania.

Back Talk

. . . informed that you have made, or are making, a study which involves the use of a questionnaire on "Sabbaticals."

We should very much like to receive a copy. . . .

Elmer D. West, Director
Office of Statistical Information
and Research
American Council on Education

Answer: Yes, I am making a kind of survey. I might explain that my opinion polls are intended as conversation pieces and not as specimens of scientific audience analysis. However, a copy of the questionnaire is enclosed. . . .

• • •

Leaflet later received: "Report on Questionnaires," No. 15, Nov. 3, 1958, item 12—(Sabbatical Leave and Ph.D. Degrees) QR 1032. A questionnaire on "sabbaticals" and on "style of address for persons having a Ph.D." Intended

as "conversation pieces and not as specimens of scientific audience analysis."

. . . would appreciate report of questionnaires on "sabbaticals" and on "style of address for a person having a Ph.D. degree. . . ."

Jill Funk
Changing Times
The Kiplinger Magazine

. . . enclosed voucher for $1.00 to cover costs of report on your questionnaires. . . .

A. H., Office of the President
X University

. . . results of questionnaire. . . .

B. B. P., Director
X University Press

. . . would appreciate report. . . . Please bill me.

J. G. H., Ph.D., Registrar
X University

Answers: (Note to secretary. Please prepare form letter QU3, expressing appreciation of interest. Better explain these were designed as "conversation pieces," etc. Will send reports later, no charge, when printer Meriwether supplies emergency offprints.)

(In "On Being Doctored," December issue, ST complained that Ann Landers, arbiter of etiquette and ethics in 267 newspapers, had been a bit vague on the matter, and threatened to write to her to get the whole thing cleared up once for all.)

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Me a straddler? I never felt that my comments left much to the imagination.

If you want to know what I *really* think (as you put it), I *really* think the Ph.D. who wished to be called "Dr." needs bolstering badly.

The great (and secure) Ph.D.s that I know make it a point to say: "Call Me Mister."

Sincerely,
Ann Landers

Dear Professor Murphy,

Re your Ph.D. Survey.

It's all a matter of pride, or practicality. (You never heard a Lieutenant Colonel referred to as Mister, did you?) The Ph.D. who prefers the title either takes pride in his achievement . . . , or he has discovered (as have I) that it works wonders with maitre d's and theatre and transportation ticket-sellers. . . .

Another thing to consider, especially in the municipal system of which I am a member (where the doctorate is virtually required for tenure—in Speech, at least), is the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty who are not of professorial rank. In order to accord these educational underlings a brief measure of academic recognition in as backhanded a fashion as possible, everyone on the faculty with the doctorate has come to be addressed as "Doctor," regardless of rank. . . .

I have been amazed at the amount of old school pride I have run into on college campuses. Before I owned my own academic regalia, I sought to borrow a colleague's in order that I might march in the procession at commencement since he was going to be out of town at the time anyway. He was perfectly willing to lend me his cap and gown, but balked at the hood because my Ph.D. was not from the same university as his! As long as there is this sort of thing about, "Doctor" is going to be clung to, reached for, and grasped at. . . .

Best wishes for a good year!

Very cordially,
John B. Newman
Queens College

DEMAND AND SUPPLY. An NEA research bulletin gives some vital statistics on supply and demand in public school teachers. In 1958, colleges supplied 115,989 graduates qualified to teach in elementary and high schools; 45,662 were men; 70,327 were women. This is a +6.32% from 1957. Speech has 1,927 of the total in the high school supply—733 men and 1,194 women (figures for elementary schools are not available). About 3% of the new supply of high school teachers are in speech.

There are 780,000 elementary school teaching positions, and 460,000 in the high schools. The shortage of supply this fall, in public schools, was 135,000 teachers.

The change in supply from 1957 was for elementary schools +.80%, for high schools +10.49%. The figures in some specific high school areas are:

Science	+18.80
Mathematics	+18.42
Physical educational (men)	+15.75
(women)	+ 8.36
Speech	+15.74
English	+ 9.70
Art	+ 1.71
Home economics	+ 0.76
Journalism	— 9.33

The supply of high school speech teachers in 1957-58 was 1,665; 1,047 of these entered teaching.

The old law of supply and demand doesn't seem to be functioning at all. Whereas 3 elementary teachers are needed for 2 high school teachers, the supply this year will be 8 to 1 in the other direction. Nor, the report says, does there seem to be much relation between available jobs and supply in subject areas: "Within the group prepared for high school teaching, the distribution of the new teachers among the high school teaching fields is all out of balance with the distribution of the existing positions." (NEA *Research Bulletin*, XXXVI, 2, "Teacher Supply and Demand.")

COLLEGE TEACHER RECRUITMENT. The American Council on Education has begun a program of recruitment of college teachers. President Arthur S. Adams, in a news release November 25, said: "Most other professions and occupations have had organized campaigns and recruitment for many years." The most critical problem in higher education is "the need for qualified college teachers."

As part of the campaign, 175,000 copies of *College Teaching as a Career*, a booklet financed by the Ford Foundation and issued by the Council, will be distributed. Designed primarily for undergraduates considering careers, the brochure contains essays by famous teachers, and facts and figures on college teaching. Some of the information is a bit on the optimistic side. For example: "The teacher entering as an instructor in the larger colleges or universities may ordinarily expect to attain the tenure rank of associate professor within five to ten years, and, particularly if he has a doctor's degree, a full professorship within ten to fifteen years"; advancement is even more rapid in smaller schools. Would it were so! Other figures, which seem about right, include details on degrees and salaries. Degrees held by faculties of four year colleges are: doctor, 37%; master, 38%; professional, 10%; bachelor, 13%; no degree, 2%. Median salaries (NEA figures) in 1,074 colleges and universities, 1957-58, were: instructors, $4,562; assistant professors, $5,595; associate professors, $6,563; professors, $8,072. The report urges undergraduates to master their tool subjects, which include "foreign languages, statistics, English composition, public speaking, even typing skill."

"Teaching is a form of talk," says Mark Van Doren in his essay, "and as such is one of the human pleasures. Man is a talking creature; he always has been, and he still is in spite of rumors that the art of conversation has declined. Any college teacher has the opportunity to revive it and restore its great ancient function; to find the truth." Copies are available free from the Council, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

WOES OF THE PH.D. When J. P. Elder became Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, in 1955, he pondered the Ph.D. program, and got out a questionnaire. It was sent to the 1,482 men who had taken their doctorates at Harvard between 1950 and 1954. The results are very engagingly reported in *Newsletter*, September 30, The Harvard Foundation for Advanced Study and Research. Everything one could think of is covered in questions and replies, including nature of program, faculty-student relationships, reasons for delay in getting a degree. Some of the reasons: language requirement, lack of money, academic ennui, love of Cambridge, psychiatric trouble, teaching. For a copy, write Gordon Huggins, Executive Director, 17 Dunster Street, Cambridge, 38.

AD LIBS FROM THE PH.D. SURVEY
(Concluded)

I know a woman faculty member in another college who has *Dr.* painted on her garbage can.

If you have a Ph.D., most people seem to be unaware of it. If you haven't, they embarrass you by calling you doctor.

I rather like the pattern at Virginia, where everyone is called mister because Thomas Jefferson preferred it that way, and no one would want to think of himself as above TJ (He received five LL.D.'s, by the way.)

A man's a man for a' that!

We reserve the doctor title for new laid Ph.D.'s. This whole problem was solved for me years ago. A very nice faculty wife came up to me at a tea and said, "Mr., ah, Dr. W! You know that I just learned you are a doctor, and I'm so sorry. I thought you were, ah, a gentleman."

If a person has to be addressed as doctor to maintain his reputation as a scholar, evidently he isn't a very active scholar.

I am the only full professor in our college of the university without a Ph.D. degree. Students insist on calling me doctor. I take

great pains to instruct them otherwise. The other day a student came up to me and said: "I understand you are not a doctor, but I would like to call you doctor anyway; I feel so impolite calling you mister."

Frankly, we like to be addressed as doctor in the clinic. It adds to our prestige with the parents especially. And why not? We Ph.D.'s worked just as hard for our degree as did the M.D.'s.

This Ph.D. matter is more serious than you think. You can't escape it. Either you spend three to six years or more in blood, sweat and tears, and get the degree, or you spend the rest of your life explaining why you didn't.

Doctor really means a learned person, or one capable of teaching. Physicians were called "doctor" not because of their calling, but because they were able to instruct. So why should M.D.'s have a monopoly on "doctor"?

I took the third degree, and brother doctor, it was the third degree. So why should I hide the fact? Yours sincerely, P.P., Ph.D.

Society Records
(Continued)

One of the most venerable institutions at Old Mizzou used to be the debating society. We sent off an inquiry. The news is good; the Athenaean still flourishes.

THE ATHENAEAN DEBATING SOCIETY, 1841—

Just eight months after the University of Missouri opened on April 14, 1841, a student debating society called the Lyceum held its first meeting. During the summer of 1842, apparently because of weaknesses in structure, the Lyceum was reorganized and renamed the Athenaean Society. One hundred and sixteen years later, the organization despite brief periods of inactivity still functions under that name.

The perpetuation of Athenaean may be attributed to the nature of its activities, loyalty of its members, even to its alumni. One contributing factor which cannot be overlooked, however, was the unique action of the 15th Missouri General Assembly. In an incorporating act passed on February 5, 1849, the state legislators gave Athenaean full legal authority to manage its affairs in any way ". . . as may not be contrary to the laws of the land. . . ." What concern such license must have caused University administrators through the years!

Early Athenaeans were a highly secretive brotherhood with meetings carefully guarded from the prying eyes of officials and rival campus groups. Minutes of the society's meetings indicate this secrecy may well have been the best policy for all concerned. One of the major problems the organization had was disciplining its members. Fines of 10 cents were levied for such things as leaving the hall while the president spoke, lying on chairs with feet extended in an "indecorous" manner, and reading magazines during debate. "The throwing of bread and expectoration of saliva impregnated with the juice of the Virginia weed," were breaches of conduct similarly frowned upon.

As Athenaean matured, its program of activities took on new stature. Top hats became an essential for members, along with an ornate badge of membership. Each week the society held debates in the best parliamentary fashion on previously selected questions. In addition, Athenaean sponsored a lecture series, bringing leading orators of the day to the campus. With the advent of inter-collegiate debating, Athenaean supplied the majority of varsity debaters. By 1914, the prestige of the society had reached such heights that a United States Senator made the two-day trip from Washington to speak at the annual banquet.

Today, Athenaean functions anew, claiming always the distinction of "oldest society of its kind west of the Mississippi." The society sponsors all collegiate and intra-mural forensic activities, including an oratory contest dating back to 1850. The survival of this organization seems fitting testimony to the place of debate and related speech activities in the scheme of education.

Thomas L. Fernandez
University of Missouri

Forensic Notes

Shop Talk regrets that space permits reporting on only a selection of the vast number of workshops, tournaments, and conferences that are held throughout the country. Persons interested in more detailed reports should subscribe to *The Register* of the American Forensic

Association. One issue carries the college calendar of events, another covers high-school events, and special issues are given to a directory of directors of debate and a travel directory. Although one may belong to the association without charge if a member of SAA, only those paying the $4.00 annual dues receive *The Register*. Robert O. Weiss, DePauw University, is secretary.

Delta Sigma Rho, at its national meeting last spring, voted to hold a tournament in alternate years, when the biennial congress is not scheduled. The first of the tournaments will be at John Carroll University, Cleveland, May 7-9. Leroy T. Laase, University of Nebraska, is chairman of the national planning committee, and Austin J. Freeley will be host.

Pi Kappa Delta will hold its 21st biennial convention at Bowling Green State University, March 22-27. Ted Nelson of St. Olaf College is convention chairman; host is Raymond Yeager.

The Capitol Hill Tournament, sponsored by the University of Maryland, will be held February 20-21, in College Park and Washington, D. C., only nine miles away. Because of limitation of space in the Senate Caucus Room of the Capitol, where final events are held before a board of judges including Senators and other dignitaries, entrants are limited to thirty-four. Finalists will appear on the CBS program, "Leading Question." Malthon M. Anapol, University of Maryland, directs the meeting.

The William Pitt Debating Union, University of Pittsburgh, has received a grant of $2,000 from the Buhl Foundation, a local philanthropic enterprise.

The Western Speech Association continued its plan of holding tournaments for students in conjunction with its annual convention, University of Utah, November 24-26.

The annual debaters' congress at Pennsylvania State University has been named the Joseph F. O'Brien Debaters' Congress in honor of its deceased founder.

To cooperate in commemorating the university's 150th anniversary, the Forensic Society of Miami University is sponsoring the Sesquicentennial Debate Tournament, April 10-11. Bernard F. Phelps and Robert W. Evans are directing the event.

DePauw University commemorated the centennial of the Lincoln-Douglas debates with a chapel program and a faculty panel. Herold T. Ross directed a dramatization of the debates for the chapel program. Robert O. Weiss prepared the script. The panel discussion, broadcast over station WGRE, was conducted by John R. Foxen, and included members of the speech and history departments.

The forensics staff of Ohio State University commemorated the Lincoln-Douglas debates with programs on WOSU-TV. Professor Emeritus Earl W. Wiley, chairman of the Ohio Lincoln sesquicentennial planning committee, presented background. Director of debate Richard Rieke played Douglas, a role he enacted at the celebration in Jonesboro, Illinois. Harland Randolph took the part of Lincoln. The series was produced by Paul A. Carmack.

The twenty-sixth Indiana High School Debaters Conference and the sixteenth Student Legislative Assembly were held on the Purdue campus December 5 and 6. There were 795 participants, representing 82 schools, who took part in the program of debates, mock legislative assemblies, and extemporaneous speaking.

Emporia State Teachers College has a "Traveling Debate Clinic," now in its eighth year. A tour of 41 high schools was made this year, requiring two weeks' traveling time. The tour is made in early fall, before college classes meet. "The Rebuttal Box," a newspaper for high school debaters, edited by Emporia debaters, is in its fifth year, and has a circulation of 1200. Jim Trent, director of forensics, supervises the projects, and issues a guide for the study of the high school question.

Pi Kappa Delta has made its first scholarship award, to William M. Delehanty, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul. The award of $300 was established in honor of John A. Shields, one of the national founders.

Reading Hours

Featured at Agnes Scott College this year have been readings from the *Canterbury Tales*, in modern and in Middle English, samples of modern American poets, and a Shakespearean program. Auditions were conducted by a panel of judges from theatre, radio, and TV.

At the University of West Virginia, a program of reading hours, under the direction of Enid Pollant, has been inaugurated. Faculty and students participate in programs developed around themes such as "The Light Touch" and "The Ballad."

The Campion Choral Speakers of Boston College have entered their third year of activity. This group consists of approximately twenty-five men students. The director would like to know if there are any similar groups. If so, write: Director, CCS, Campion Hall, Boston College.

Fresno State College recently inaugurated a bi-weekly series of concert readings of the great plays of history.

Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, holds monthly play readings for students interested in the theatre.

The Oral Interpretation Interest Group of SAA has available a number of readings recorded on tape by teachers and students. Dubbings of these tapes may be had from the SAA Tape Exchange, San Jose State College. Simply mail a blank tape (or tapes) and enclose return postage with your request. L. H. Mouat at San Jose urges you to send in your own readings on tapes or those of your students. He will send you a list of tapes now available.

Readers Theatre at Syracuse, during the first semester, produced Sean O'Casey's play for narrator and five actors, *Pictures in the Hallway*, and Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*.

Readers Workshop, University of Washington, directed by Wilma Grimes, gives a weekly series over KXA, occasional programs on KING-TV, and a campus series. Major presentation of the year was *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*.

The Readers Theatre, Adelphi College, is in its ninth year of presenting original adaptations of dramatic literature. Major production this year is an hour long adaptation of *The Crock of Gold*, made by Josephine Nichols, director. Programs are available to club and community groups for a fee of $30.

Radio and TV

Marietta College is experimenting in teaching the required freshman speech course over a closed circuit of a Dage television system. One general lecture a week is given via television to all 14 sections. For the other two sessions a week, the students meet with individual instructors in groups of 20 or fewer. The results obtained will be compared with the effectiveness of teaching the same course in sections of 20, and in large groups. W. J. Friederick, head of the Speech Department, lectures. He estimates that TV will allow each instructor to handle 50% more students in the same amount of time and with the same personal supervision of speech needs.

New studios for teaching radio and TV courses are being equipped at Penn State. A closed-circuit TV chain can be connected with the facilities of WFBG-TV in Altoona, Pennsylvania. The campus radio station broadcasts for two hours daily through the local commercial station, WMAJ.

At the State University of Iowa, Paul Heinberg is experimenting in teaching Dramatic Interpretation over closed circuit TV.

The University of Miami is dramatizing its speakers bureau in a program "Speakers from Miami" on the university's station, WMUG-FM. A speaker is introduced, speaks, and then takes questions from the "audience," as in an actual situation. The speakers bureau, directed by Bernard F. Phelps, has supplied speakers for organizations the past twenty-five years.

At the University of Oregon, the Classroom Television Project investigating inter-institutional teaching has continued under the direction of J. David Lewis. Two courses, one in the Appreciation of Literature, and one in the Appreciation of Music, have been developed. In addition to classroom television, the University is also providing an evening of programming over KOAC-TV.

Theatre Schedules

Adelphi College: *The Cocktail Party, Crock of Gold, A Doll's House, Aphrodite*, an evening of one-act plays, and a dance workshop.

Agnes Scott College: *The Enchanted*, a bill of American one-act plays.

American University: *Hobson's Choice, Our Town, Candida, The Telephone* and *Down in the Valley, The Madwoman of Chaillot, The Crucible*.

Drake University: *Harvey, The Matchmaker, Cymbeline, The Dybbuk, The Lark*.

El Camino College: *Ten Little Indians, Please Marry My Nellie, Diary of Ann Frank, The Matchmaker, Night Must Fall*.

Grove City College: *The Playboy of the Western World, Henry IV*—Part One, *The Crucible, Thieves' Carnival*.

Illinois Wesleyan University: *The Matchmaker, Tea and Sympathy, Fumed Oak, The Vise, The Adding Machine*.

Iowa State College: *Stalag 17, Ghosts, Taming of the Shrew*.

Kalamazoo College: *The Importance of Being Earnest, Under Milk Wood* (readers theatre), *Waiting for Godot, The Boy Friend*, in cooperation with the music and physical education departments.

Lehigh University: *Time Limit!, Murder in the Cathedral*.

Manchester College: *Tiger at the Gates, The Long Christmas Dinner, Sleep of Prisoners, Overtones, R. U. R.*

Marietta College: *A Member of the Wedding, Blood Wedding.*

Northeastern University: *Pygmalion, The Great Sebastians, Carousel, Bus Stop.*

Northern Illinois University: *The Silver Whistle, The Scarecrow, The Menaechmi.*

San Fernando Valley State College: *Pygmalion, Hansel and Gretel, Hedda Gabler.*

San Jose State College: *The Sleeping Prince, The Flies.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *Merchant of Venice, Bell, Book, and Candle, Second Shepherds' Play, The Crying Princess and the Golden Goose,* annual children's play.

Texas Technological College: Anouilh's *Antigone.*

University of Hartford: *The Miser.*

University of Kansas: *The King and I, An Italian Straw Hat, Treasure Island,* children's theatre production.

University of Kansas City: *Inherit the Wind, Electra,* with guest star, Judith Evelyn, *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, Blood Wedding; Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp, The Magic Horn of Charlemagne,* children's theatre productions; *The Taming of the Shrew,* a new opera by Vittorio Giannini.

University of Pittsburgh: *The Would-be Invalid,* Anouilh's *Medea,* two Tennessee Williams one-act plays.

University of Richmond: *The Solid Gold Cadillac, A Visit to a Small Planet, John Brown's Body, Antigone.*

University of Southern California: *Damn Yankees, The Second Shepherds' Play, The Nativity, The Waltz of the Toreadors, Medea.*

Western Michigan University: *On Borrowed Time, The Children's Hour, Major Barbara, Western Star, Everyman, Death of a Salesman; Mystery of the Sandlewood Box, Peter Rabbit,* children's theatre productions.

College of Wooster: *Everyman Today,* with John Beal, guest star.

Curriculum

The American University, Washington, D. C., has established a Department of Speech and Drama under the chairmanship of Jack H. Yocum. Added to the staff were Dale E. Wolgamuth, assistant professor in rhetoric and public address, and Herman L. Zillmer, technical director of the theatre. A bachelor of arts degree is offered with a speech and drama major or a performance major in theatre-radio-TV.

The Speech and Hearing Center of Temple University announces an affiliated program with Magee Hospital. Graduate students and assistants will be assigned to the Magee speech and hearing program as therapists. The work will be supervised by Murray M. Halfond, Director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

On July 1, 1958, the San Fernando Valley Campus of Los Angeles State College became a separate entity, the San Fernando Valley State College. The Department of Speech and Drama in the new college offers bachelor's degrees in speech and in drama, and a teaching major and minor in speech-drama. The M.A. degree in speech-drama is offered. This fall the department will begin a degree program in speech therapy.

Buildings

The University of Missouri students in television now have the use of new facilities in a large studio, including two vidicon cameras with the necessary switching and lighting equipment. Students also have access to the University's commercial station, KOMU-TV. The Speech and Hearing Clinic has moved into newly-remodeled Parker Hall. Ground was broken early this fall for the new Fine Arts Center, which will include a new theatre, to be ready for occupancy some time during the next academic year.

Texas College of Arts and Industries expects to move into its new Speech Building with its little theatre in September.

In September the Department of Speech at the University of Arizona moved into its spacious, newly remodeled quarters in the Education Building. Included are speech clinic facilities, practice rooms, class rooms, and offices—all air-conditioned.

The Speech Department of the University of Minnesota Duluth Branch has moved into new quarters in the Humanities Building on the new 200 acre campus of the branch. In addition to classrooms and offices, the new quarters house a speech and hearing clinic. In another building a new studio theatre features a balcony which completely encircles the back of the stage. There are also acting areas forward of the proscenium arch on both stage right and stage left. Harold Hayes, director of the University Theatre, and William Morgan, associate director, were the designers.

Lamar State College of Technology expects to move into its $600,000 Fine Arts Building in September. In addition to classrooms, offices, and radio-TV studio, there will be a combination recital hall and theatre for intimate theatre. The remodeled Lamar Tech Theatre opened in November. Rewiring, the addition of three ceiling catwalks, enlargement and extension of the stage, and acoustical treatment are some of the new features.

APPOINTMENTS

Adelphi College: Stanley Gould.

El Camino College: Lyle H. Clark, Leslie Thomas, Robert B. Schlihs, instructors.

Illinois State Normal University: Jamil I. Toubbeh, technical director of theatre.

Lamar State College of Technology: Cecil D. Jones, Jr., assistant professor of speech, director of theatre; Norman H. Sanders, instructor in evening classes.

Marietta College: Walter Hobba.

North Dakota State Teachers College: Erwin F. Karner.

Occidental College: Paul Hunsinger, associate professor of speech.

San Fernando Valley State College: Willard F. Bellman, assistant professor of drama, designer-technical director of theatre; James Brock, assistant professor of drama, associate director of theatre.

State University of New York College for Teachers, Albany: Ryland H. Hewitt (Bates College), associate professor.

Temple University: M. Irwin Kuhr, instructor, director of men's debate; David F. Reifsnyder, instructor, director of student speakers bureau; Faye G. Katz, Jack Smith, instructors, members of the speech and hearing center staff; Alan J. Schwartz, Michael Schwartz, John Mossberg, Ann Kirkpatrick, Bette Lefcourt, Peter L. Morris, assistants.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Jean Taylor, assistant professor of speech, in charge of children's theatre; Keith Kennedy, instructor in speech, technical director, debate coach.

University of Arizona: Jack Howe, assistant professor, director of forensics; Paul McCready, instructor in speech.

University of Kansas: Joan Eckles, Lynn R. Osborn, Joseph C. Rhea, instructors in speech and drama.

University of Missouri: Robert P. Friedman, assistant professor, director of forensics; Thelma Trombly, assistant professor; Lewis W. Stoerker, assistant professor and technical director of workshop; Fred Phelps, instructor; Eugene Ritter, speech and hearing staff clinician.

University of Nebraska: Joseph Baldwin (University of Mississippi), assistant professor of speech and dramatic arts; Ernest Burgi (Bowling Green University), assistant professor of speech pathology and audiology; Howard Martin, instructor in radio and television.

University of North Carolina: Lucia C. Morgan.

University of Oklahoma: William Carmack, assistant professor; J. W. Patterson, instructor; Edward Brown, Ray Corvin, Benne Daniel, Mrs. Ruth Langston, Gene Garrison, John O'Hara, Holt Spicer, William Floyd, Margaret Losey, John Bruce Keith, Floyd Emanuel, Dean Harris, Paul Rittmanic, Peggy Poling, Kay Williams, Jerry Murphy, assistants.

University of Oregon: Bruce Campbell, assistant, station manager for station KWAX; Preston Tuttle, instructor in speech; Louis W. Cockerham, assistant in debate.

University of Texas: Dorothy Clifford, assistant professor; Martin Todaro (University of Maryland), instructor and director of forensics; Jack E. Douglas, University of Oklahoma, visiting associate professor.

University of Virginia: George A. Sanborn, assistant professor.

University of Vermont: Alfred J. Albrecht, instructor and director of debate.

University of Wisconsin: Kenneth E. Andersen, Lee Beltzer, Gail W. Compton, Patricia A. Feiser, Bruce H. Kendall, Sieghard Krueger, Frank E. Laycock, Wilmer A. Linkugel, Alfred Miller, Lois A. Nelson, Edward Pixley, Delbert L. Rasmussen, Jean Scharfenbert, Thomas F. Wirkus, assistants.

Valparaiso University: Kalman A. Burnim, assistant professor of speech and drama.

Vanderbilt University: William H. Veatch, State College of Washington, visiting director of forensics.

Wake Forest College: Julian C. Burroughs (University of Michigan), instructor, director of WFDD.

Walla Walla College: Jonathan G. Penner, instructor.

West Virginia University: Enid Pallant, instructor, director of interpretation; Richard Newdick, instructor, director of scene shop; Dan Goulding, instructor, director of the theatre box office; Fritz Neyhart, instructor, director of debate.

Western Michigan College: Robert Marsden, instructor in speech and theatre, designer-technician.

William and Mary: Russell Hastings, instructor and designer for theatre; Charles Woodliff, assistant professor, director of radio and television; Lois Jane Quaid, director of costumes for department of dramatic art, Richmond Professional Institute.

Williams College: Forbes I. Hill, instructor.

Wilson Branch, Chicago City College System: Laurence Hamburg, director of debate; Leonard Shapiro, Walter Cameron, David Crane, instructors.

PROMOTIONS

Abilene Christian College: Mrs. Bob Whittaker, assistant professor.

Baylor University: Lola Walker, professor.

Bradley University: Robert Cagle, assistant professor.

Carnegie Institute of Technology: Charles W. Moore, associate professor of drama; Cecil Kitcat, associate professor of stage movement.

Colorado State University: Roy C. Nelson, professor; Randall C. Ruechelle, associate professor; Thomas H. Napiecinski, acting director of dramatics.

Cornell University: H. D. Albright, professor.

Furman University: Dorothy Richey, professor.

Kansas State College: Forest L. Whan, head of the department; Norma D. Bunton, associate professor.

Michigan State University: Kenneth G. Hance, acting head of the department. John E. Dietrich of Ohio State becomes head this fall.

Mississippi Southern College: Gilbert F. Hartwig, chairman of the department; Robert M. Treser, director of theatre.

Muskingum College: Robert N. Montgomery, head of the department.

Purdue University: Erling E. Kildahl, associate professor; Richard S. Jackson, Henry Z. Scheele, instructors.

San Jose State College: J. Wendell Johnson, professor; Rollin E. Buckman, assistant professor; Thomas R. Coke, instructor.

South Dakota State College: Burris Edwards, instructor.

Stanford University: Stanley Donner, professor; Robert Loper, associate professor.

Stetson University: Mary Louise Gehring, chairman; Charles C. Ritter, director of theatre.

Temple University: Gordon F. Hostettler, professor; John Borriello, assistant professor.

Texas Christian University: Dorothy M. Bell, assistant professor.

University of Florida: Margaret C. McClellan, assistant professor; Darrel J. Mase, dean of the College of Health Related Services in the university's medical center.

University of Hawaii: Lucille Breneman, James R. Linn, assistant professors; Duane Black, Lorinda Watson, Kenneth Sereno, instructors.

University of Kansas City: Douglas Russell, assistant professor.

University of Michigan: Edward Stasheff, D. E. Morley, professors; Hayden K. Carruth, associate professor.

University of North Dakota: Henry G. Lee associate professor.

University of West Virginia: Leonard Davis, assistant professor.

Vanderbilt University: Kenneth W. Pauli, assistant professor.

William and Mary: Howard Scammon, associate professor; Donald McConkey, assistant professor.

E. J. WEST, 1903-1958

Edward Joseph West, Professor of English Literature and Speech, University of Colorado, died October 23 of a coronary occlusion, at the age of fifty-five. He was born at Hudson, New York, April 9, 1903.

Mr. West was graduated from Cornell University in 1925. His first two years of teaching, 1925-1927, were at Syracuse University. In 1927, recommended by A. M. Drummond as a promising teacher of literature and director of plays, he was engaged by the University of Colorado in Boulder, where he was a member of the faculty the rest of his life. In 1930-1931 he returned to Cornell for an M.A. degree under A. M. Drummond. In 1937 he went to Yale on a Rockefeller scholarship for study on a Ph.D. degree, which was awarded in 1940. His dissertation, *Histrionic Methods and Acting Traditions on the London Stage, 1870-1890*, was directed by Allardyce Nicoll.

From 1927 to 1946, he directed plays. He produced and directed seventy full length plays and about as many one-acts. His first production was Shaw's *Arms and the Man*. It revealed an interest in Shaw which was persistently developed. Recently he edited two collections of Shaw, *Advice to a Young Critic and Other Letters*, 1955, and *Shaw on Theatre*, 1958. His reputation as a Shavian scholar was established in this country and abroad.

Although he had an intensive interest in Shaw, Mr. West's concerns were wide and

varied. His courses ranged from Keats to Milton. For *Studies in Speech and Drama*, in honor of his teacher, A. M. Drummond, he wrote "Henry Irving, 1870-1890." He was responsible for collecting and editing *Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays*, 1945, and wrote for it "G.B.S., Music, and Shakespearean Blank Verse."

Mr. West's relations with *QJS* were very close. He was a consistent contributor of major articles and book reviews, and served two terms as associate editor (drama), 1948-1950, and 1954-1956. He also contributed to *Theatre Annual, Western Humanities Review, Educational Theatre Journal*, and other journals.

Although beset with ill health the last fifteen years of his life, he persisted in his productive scholarship. Mr. West made a memorable contribution to life and letters. He gave unstinted service to the theatre and his students. He was a keen critic with a fine perception, artistic integrity, and independent judgment, and he gave his best effort to further an appreciation of a great literary figure of our time.

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS
Professor of English
and Speech, Emeritus
Head of Department, 1919-1945
University of Colorado

IDA LEVINSON, 1900-1958

Ida Levinson, Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Illinois, died of heart failure, December 5. She was born in Paxton, Illinois, November 6, 1900.

Miss Levinson received a B.S. degree from Northwestern University in 1942, and an M.S. from the University of Illinois in 1947. From 1922-1926 she taught in the primary grades at Wheeling, Illinois, and from 1926-1946 at Glenview.

She joined the speech clinic staff in 1946. Her special interests were speech development therapy for children and post-operative cleft palate cases. She was a supervisor in the clinic, and advisor to the undergraduate students in training. From her years of work in the primary grades, she brought to her clinic instruction a skill, understanding, and sympathy which were exceptional.

She was a faithful and devoted member of SAA, ASHA, and the Illinois Speech Association. She was interested in the professional activities of Zeta Phi Eta, served as sponsor of the local chapter, and maintained close contact with the alumnae.

Miss Levinson was a woman of gentle manners and warm sincerity. Her work was her life. A memorial to her is being planned. Whatever form it may take, the memory of Ida Levinson will be most fully perpetuated in the lives of the many who were under her instruction and care, in the public schools and in the University Speech Clinic.

MARIE ORR SHERE
University of Illinois

PERSONALS

Paul D. Bagwell, formerly of Michigan State, and executive vice-president of SAA, 1952-54, ran against Governor Mennen G. Williams of Michigan, on the Republican ticket, in November. Shots of a TV debate between the candidates were run in various parts of the country. Result: no change. Professor Bagwell is now dean of scholarships back at Michigan State.

McKenzie W. Buck, head of the speech and hearing clinic, University of Florida, plans to return to Puerto Rico next summer to carry on studies of patients with defective palates. The study was begun last summer as a team project, with representatives from dental schools, health centers, and speech clinics.

Glenn R. Capp, chairman of the Baylor speech department, is a special lecturer for the graduate program of the Brooks Army Air Force hospital administration program at Fort Sam Houston, Texas.

A. R. Christensen, head of the speech department at South Dakota State College, has been appointed administrative assistant to the president of the college. He will continue to serve as department head until an appointment to that position is made.

H. Barrett Davis, Lehigh University, has been awarded an honorary master's degree from Emerson College, Boston. Mr. Davis graduated from Emerson in 1929.

This month G. E. Densmore retires as chairman of the department of speech, University of Michigan, and goes on sabbatical leave. He has been at Michigan thirty-six years. The depart- is now in its sixty-seventh year, and has a staff of seventy-three. William Sattler is acting chairman.

Norman W. Freestone, chairman of the Occidental College speech department, is in charge of a festival of arts program scheduled for May. The theme of the festival will be "Religious Expression in the Arts," with the departments of art, music and speech participating.

Harold F. Harding of Ohio State (*QJS* editor 1948-1950) is now a brigadier general, USAR. He is division artillery commander of Ohio's 83rd infantry division (reserve). The stars were pinned by Major General Ralph W. Zwicker and Mrs. Harding, in a ceremony at Ft. Hayes. Professor Harding conducts the National Security Policy Seminar at Ohio State.

Donald Hayworth of Michigan State was the Democratic candidate for Congress in Michigan's Sixth District. He served in Congress in 1954-56, but was defeated for reelection by .8%. The race in the Sixth was a *Time* cover-story (October 27). Result: Professor Hayworth will continue teaching speech.

Ben G. Hennecke has been installed as president of Tulsa University. He was director of the university theatre and radio station. For the past four years he has been administrative vice-president of the university.

Wilbur Samuel Howell of Princeton (*QJS* editor, 1954-56) held a colloquium on rhetoric at Stanford two weeks in August. Leland T. Chapin of Stanford directed the colloquium.

Wendell Johnson, University of Iowa, was the principal speaker at the opening session, Pennsylvania Speech Association Convention, in October.

John Keltner has resigned from Kansas State College to work with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in St. Louis.

When Jerome Landfield took his doctoral orals at Missouri University in May, three academic generations were represented. Landfield was directed by Loren Reid, who had been directed by A. Craig Baird at Iowa, who was one of the examiners.

Robert Loper of Stanford, who was staff director of the Ashland, Oregon, Shakespearean festival last summer, will direct again next summer.

S. M. Marks of Purdue has been elected president of Theta Alpha Phi, national honorary dramatics fraternity.

Robert T. Oliver of Penn State spent six weeks last summer in Korea as consultant to the Government of the Republic of Korea. Two new translations of his book, *Syngman Rhee: The Man Behind the Myth*, have been published in Tokyo and Kobe. This biography had previously been translated into Korean and twice into Chinese. Four other books by Mr. Oliver have been translated into Korean or Chinese, and one into Japanese.

James M. O'Neill, first president of SAA and first editor of *QJS*, conducted a seminar at Purdue in November.

Loren Reid of Missouri (Shop Talk editor, 1954-56, president, SAA, 1957) was guest speaker at the Oklahoma Speech Association in October. In November he was the guest banquet speaker at the Western Speech Association convention in Salt Lake City.

Fred Scheller of Pacific University has been appointed to the Governor's board (Oregon) on educational television.

Ted Skinner, Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Texas, has been appointed dean of the new School of Fine and Applied Arts. He will continue as head of the speech department.

John Wesley Swanson, professor of speech at the University of Illinois, has resigned as supervisor of university dramatic productions—a position he held for 31 years—to become executive secretary of the department. Joseph W. Scott, director of theatre, becomes supervisor.

THAT TAX. *Your Federal Income Tax, 1959 Edition*, issued by the Internal Revenue Service, says: "If you travel as a form of education, your expenditures will be considered as primarily personal in nature and not deductible. This includes travel while on *sabbatical leave*" (p. 39—italics supplied by the service). This ruling is in keeping with the general policy of not allowing any exemptions in order "to fulfill your general educational aspirations." If your aspirations are commercial in nature, you may deduct, including costs of advertising. The income tax laws seem to be written and rewritten by people who hate their old teachers.

Better have it specified in your leave that you are on college duty, not on a purely personal jaunt. It has been held in the courts that the college requirement for a report of what was done on a sabbatical leave is evidence of official assignment, expenses deductible. For a detailed treatment see "Sabbatical Leave Travel Expenses and the Federal Income Tax" by William W. Oliver, *AAUP Bulletin*, XLIII, 507-511. ST knows a man who got $1,667.05 tax exempt allowance for sabbatical expenses in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, on the grounds his employer assigned him there.

Convention Notes

The 43rd annual SAA convention, held in cooperation with AETA and various other societies, came off on schedule. There was the

usual giant Christmas tree in the great lobby of the Stevens (now the Conrad Hilton), the usual business and scurrying, the frantic "But when can we get together?" exchanges, the quiet sessions in rooms various. Attendance was counted at 1,690 by Carl Pitt, chairman of the General Convention Committee.

The Legislative Assembly stood, in memory of Joseph F. O'Brien, deceased parliamentarian of the group. Paul A. Carmack of Ohio State was selected to succeed Professor O'Brien. Wayne Thompson was appointed to serve another three-year term as clerk.

Only one general meeting, in addition to the business meeting, was held. It was the convention luncheon. Paul D. Bagwell of Michigan State recounted his experiences in running against Governor G. Mennen Williams. The cashier sold 320 tickets, and ushers collected 313.

Thirty doughty souls turned up for the annual business meeting. Gone are the reports of officers and editors, the electioneering for members of the nominating committee. Under the new constitution all these details are handled in the interest groups, Assembly, and Council. Retiring president Elise Hahn turned over the gavel to John E. Dietrich, and new officers were introduced.

A note on the Hilton dressers says 2,500,000 individual meals were served last year, and that the Training Department offers "our employees such programs as a course in Effective Speech, and a Great Books course."

There was much arguing about time and place of future conventions, in both Council and Assembly. In 1961 and 1962 there will be Christmas conventions, in New York City and in Cleveland. The Time and Place Committee recommended Chicago for 1963, but the westerners and augustans swung the decision to Denver in August.

Secretary Peterson reported the association sound fiscally. Income for the year was $67,044.53. Expenditures were $58,428.61, leaving a surplus of $8,615.92. A budget of $79,465 was approved for 1959-1960.

The placement bureaus were unusually active, with crowds of a dozen or so at a time around the tables. AETA had 131 applicants in person for 67 jobs.

NEW EDITORS

Elected for a three-year term, to start in January, 1960, are two new SAA editors, Douglas Ehninger for *Monographs* and Richard Murphy for *QJS*.

Interest Group Officers—1959

Executive Secretary Peterson, in herculean effort, has supplied the names of all interest group officers. If you want to join a group, write to the secretary. The vice-chairman will welcome your suggestions for next year's program.

Administrative Policies and Practices

Chairman: Wofford Gardner
Vice-Chairman: Gordon Hostettler
Secretary: Wayne C. Eubank
Advisory Committee: Horace Rahskopf, J. Jeffery Auer, Ralph McGinnis
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Harold Weiss
Representative on Committee on Ethics: H. P. Constans

American Forensic Association

C: Robert P. Newman
V-C: Victor M. Powell
S: Robert O. Weiss
A: Herbert James, Austin Freeley, William S. Howell
D: Robert Kully
R: William Clark

Business and Professional Speaking

C: James N. Holm
V-C: Raymond S. Ross
S: Francis E. X. Dance
A: Thomas Dahle, Harold P. Zelko, Wesley Wiksell
D: William Haney
R: N. B. Beck

Discussion and Group Methods

C: Franklyn S. Haiman
V-C: Thorrel Fest
S: Martin Andersen
A: Donald Smith, Laura Crowell, William Howell
D: Victor Harnack
R: Carl Pitt

General Semantics and Related Methodologies

C: Wilbur Moore
V-C: William Conboy
S: William Elsen
A: Elwood Murray, Wendell Johnson, Murton Babcock
D: John Brilhart
R: John Newman

High School Discussion and Debate

C: Ralph McGee
V-C: James M. Hill
S: Una Lee Voight

A: Malcolm Bump, George Z. De Bell, Gene Duckworth
D: Ivan L. Rehn
R: Nancy Weir

History of Speech Education
C: Marceline Erickson
V-C: Milton Wiksell
S: Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr.
A: John T. Rickey, Giles W. Gray, Edyth Renshaw
D: Marceline Erickson
R: Robert Clark

Interpretation
C: Melvin R. White
V-C: Keith Brooks
S: Chloe Armstrong
A: Elbert Bowen, Tony Ostroff, Francine Merritt
D: Keith Brooks
R: L. Lamont Okey

Parliamentary Procedure
C: Giles W. Gray
V-C: Thomas A. Hopkins
S: William Tacey
A: H. Barrett Davis, Paul Carmack, Emogene Emery
D: Thomas A. Hopkins
R: Giles W. Gray

Personal and Social Psychology
C: Jack Matthews
V-C: William Sattler
S: Robert Goyer
A: Andrew Weaver, Wallace Fotheringham, Donald Sikkink
D: Raymond Ross
R: Franklin H. Knower

Radio-Television-Film
C: Robert Haakenson
V-C: James Lynch
S: Robert Crawford
A: Bruce Linton, John Ulrich, Robert Summers
D: Tom Battin
R: Wayne Bundy

Rhetoric and Public Address
C: Marie Hochmuth
V-C: Frederick Haberman
S: Wayne Minnick
A: Robert Clark, A. Craig Baird, Waldo Braden
D: George Bohman
R: Charles Lomas

Speech and Hearing Disorders
C: Dorathy Eckelmann
V-C: Bernard Schlanger
S: Charlotte E. Cleeland
A: John P. Moncur
D: Jay Sanders
R: Richard L. Schiefelbusch

Speech for Foreign and Bilingual Students
C: Claude L. Shaver
V-C: James W. Abel
S: Klonda Lynn
A: A. T. Cordray, Eva Currie, Klonda Lynn
D: Klonda Lynn
R: Elizabeth Carr

Speech for Religious Workers
C: John Rudin
V-C: Lowell McCoy
S: Roy Umble
A: W. C. Craig, Charles Weniger, Alfred Edyvean
D: William Clark
R: Paul Brandes

Speech in the Elementary Schools
C: James White
V-C: Jean Ervin
S: Marcella Oberle
A: Carrie Rasmussen
D: Ellen Kauffman
R: Evelyn Steele

Speech in Secondary Schools
C: Freda Kenner
V-C: Ralph Lane
S: Doris Niles
A: Yetta Mitchell, Milton Dobkin, Edna Gilbert
D: Evelyn Konigsberg
R: Gladys Borchers

Undergraduate Speech Instruction
C: Robert S. Goyer
V-C: Elton Abernathy
S: Jean Mayhew
A: Dana Woodbridge, Stanley F. Rutherford, Bernard Phelps
D: Robert S. Goyer
R: Theodore F. Nelson

Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics
C: Shelia Morrison
V-C: Elizabeth Carr
S: H. Hardy Perritt
A: Hilda Fisher
D: Clinton Bradford
R: Claude M. Wise

university of denver
SCHOOL OF SPEECH

examples of advanced programs of study

MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE

52½ graduate quarter hours without thesis
45 graduate quarter hours with thesis

major concentrations	cognate areas
Discussion and Public Address	Communication Methodology
Speech and Hearing Disorders	Psychology
Communication Methodology	Theatre Arts
Oral Interpretation	Radio and TV

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

majors	minors	cognate areas
Public Address and Discussion	Speech Pathology	Communication Methodology
Speech Pathology and Hearing	Communication Methodology	Psychology and Special Education
Theatre Arts	Oral Interpretation	English Literature
Communication Methodology	Mass Media	Business Administration or Social Science
Mass Media	Communication Methodology	English Literature

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SPEECH CONFERENCE

28th Annual General and College Meeting ..... February 12, 13 and 21
28th Annual High School Meeting ..... February 20 and 21

1959 SUMMER SESSION

7th Workshop for Directors of Forensics ..... June 15-July 24
24th Summer High School Institute ..... June 15-July 17
13th Summer Laboratory in Interpersonal Communication .... June 15-Aug. 14
12th Summer Workshop in Basic Communication ..... June 15-July 17

winter quarter
January 5-March 20, 1959

spring quarter
March 30-June 10, 1959

summer session
June 15-August 14, 1959

autumn quarter
September 17-December 4, 1959

for further information write:

ELWOOD MURRAY, Ph.D., Director
School of Speech, Box A
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado